

5594
May 10, 1948

A CHINESE QUARTERLY

PRINTED
NUMBER
1948

L

Vol

**John
Rom
I
Sam**

**John
Ang
Par
John
Earl**

**The
Wh
Chr
On
Chr
Pre
The**

**"Th
Dec
Pro
The
"Th
"To
Chr
A R
Boo**

Copy

150

RELIGION IN LIFE

A CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY

Vol. XVII

Spring Number, 1948

No. 2

EDITORIAL BOARD

NOLAN B. HARMON, JR., *Editor-in-Chief*

ERMINIE HUNTRRESS LANTERO, *Assistant Editor*

JOHN BAILLIE
ROBBINS WOLCOTT
BARSTOW
SAMUEL McCREA CAVERT

GERALD CRAGG
LYNN HAROLD HOUGH
JOHN KNOX

KENNETH S. LATOURETTE
G. ASHTON OLDHAM
HOWARD C. ROBBINS
PAUL SCHERER

ADVISORY COUNCIL

John Keith Benton
Angus Dun
Paul Bentley Kern
John Alexander Mackay
Earl Bowman Marlatt

W. E. McCulloch
Arthur Cushman
McGiffert, Jr.
Robert Hastings Nichols
Richard Campbell Raines

Luther D. Reed
D. Elton Trueblood
Gregory Vlastos
Leslie D. Weatherhead
Luther A. Weigle

CONTENTS

	PAGE
The Temptations of a Christian.....	Bernard W. Anderson 168
What Is the City Doing to Christian Life?.....	Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy 171
Christianity and Reason.....	Mack B. Stokes 182
On Cutting Ice.....	Lockhart Amerman 193
Christianity in a Concentration Camp.....	Otto Stargardt 204
Preparation for Amsterdam.....	John C. Bennett 211
The Churches and International Affairs.....	O. Frederick Nolde and Sartell Prentice, Jr. 218
"That Queer Sect"—the Quakers.....	Seal Thompson 228
Decentralization—Restoring Society at Its Roots.....	Mildred Jensen Loomis 238
Protestant Union and Denominational Loyalty.....	Herbert C. Alleman 250
The Living Word.....	John Paterson 258
"The Private Devotions"—A Theological Reprint.....	Lancelot Andrewes 268
"To Be Confined . . . and Dishonorably Discharged".....	Frederick W. Brink 270
Christianity and Liberty.....	Cecil Northcott 283
A Review of the Quarter's Fiction.....	John C. Schroeder 293
Book Reviews	298

Copyright, 1948, by Stone and Pierce. All rights reserved—no part of this magazine may be produced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher, except by a reviewer who wishes to quote brief passages in connection with a review written for inclusion in magazine or newspaper.

Printed in the United States of America

Published by

ABINGDON-COKESBURY PRESS

150 FIFTH AVENUE

NEW YORK

Who's Who?

HERBERT C. ALLEMAN, D.D., LL.D. Professor Emeritus of Old Testament, Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania.

LOCKHART AMERMAN, M.A., D.D. Minister, The Presbyterian Church, Sewickley, Pennsylvania.

BERNARD W. ANDERSON, M.A., B.D., Ph.D. Instructor in Religion, Colgate University, Hamilton, New York.

JOHN C. BENNETT, M.A., D.D. Professor of Christian Theology and Ethics, Union Theological Seminary, New York.

FREDERICK W. BRINK, Th.B., Th.D. Chaplain, U. S. Naval Disciplinary Barracks, Terminal Island, San Pedro, California.

MILDRED JENSEN LOOMIS, B.Sc., M.A. Formerly in adult education and religious education, and Educational Director, The School of Living, Suffern, New York. Editor, *The Interpreter*; Lane's End Homestead, Brookville, Ohio.

CECIL NORTHCOTT, M.A. Home Secretary, London Missionary Society, Westminster, London, England.

O. FREDERICK NOLDE, D.D., Ph.D. Professor, Lutheran Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, and Dean of the Graduate School; Director of the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs, New York City.

SARTELL PRENTICE, JR., B.A., M.B.A. Administrative Secretary of this Commission, and a Director of the American Waldensian Aid Society.

JOHN PATERSON, M.A., B.D., Ph.D. Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis, Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, New Jersey.

EUGEN ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY, J.U.D., Ph.D. In Germany a labor leader, promoter of voluntary labor camps for students, workers, peasants; and Professor of Law and Sociology, Breslau University. Now Professor of Social Philosophy, Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire; trained CCC leaders at Camp William James.

JOHN C. SCHROEDER, D.D., LL.D. Master of Calhoun College and Professor of Homiletics and Pastoral Theology, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut.

OTTO STARGARDT, J.U.D. Formerly a Judge of the Supreme Court, Berlin, Germany, and member of a Provincial Synod. Pleasant Ridge, Michigan.

MACK B. STOKES, B.D., Ph.D. Professor of Christian Doctrine, Candler School of Theology, Emory University, Georgia.

SEAL THOMPSON. Professor Emeritus, Biblical History and Literature, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Massachusetts.

RELIGION IN LIFE is published quarterly by Abingdon-Cokesbury Press at 75 cents per copy. Subscription price, \$2.00 per year, \$3.00 for three years in the United States and possessions and Mexico; Canada, postage 18 cents per year additional; other foreign postage, 30 cents per year additional. For the convenience of readers in Great Britain, subscriptions will be received by the Epworth Press, 25-35 City Road, London, E. C. 1, at the rate of nine shillings and sixpence per year.

Publication office, 810 Broadway, Nashville 2, Tennessee. Editorial office, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York 11, New York. Entered as Second Class Matter, August 26, 1942, at the post office in Nashville, Tennessee, under Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized March 16, 1923.

The Temptations of a Christian*

BERNHARD W. ANDERSON

*The three temptations of Jesus are repeated in the Christian's life—
Lent should remind us that we are personally
involved in the wilderness sojourn.*

AS ONCE AGAIN the Christian Church looks toward Easter, it is well to be reminded of the historical origin of the fast known as Lent. This pre-Easter fast began rather modestly with Christians remembering the approximately forty hours between Good Friday and Easter, the hours between the Crucifixion and the Resurrection. In the course of time, however, the fast was gradually lengthened, until sometime in the seventh century the Quadragesima or forty-day period was fixed authoritatively by the Church on the basis of Jesus' forty-day sojourn in the wilderness. Today the same general situation continues to exist within Christendom: according to its spirit, Lent commemorates the Passion and Crucifixion of Jesus; according to its form, the Quadragesima, Lent is patterned after the forty-day period of prayer and fasting which Jesus spent in the wilderness at the beginning of his ministry. Says the Scripture account: "And he was in the wilderness forty days, tempted of Satan."

But there is more than an artificial, calendar connection between the temptations in the wilderness and the events which lead up to and culminate in Easter. The significance of the story of the temptations lies not in the forty-day period which now defines the extent of Lent; rather, that significance derives from the vivid delineation of the human situation in whose context the events of Easter stand out with triumphant meaning. In other words, for the Christian the temptation story sets the problem: our present involvement in the Kingdom of Evil—while the Cross and Resurrection provide the answer: the manifestation of God's Kingdom with judgment and power.

These forty days of Lent, therefore, should bring upon us the realization that we are personally involved in the wilderness sojourn, not merely in the sense that we are participating in a period of fasting or devout religious exercise, but in the sense that we are constantly assailed by the very temptations which the Scripture record depicts. We miss the central

* This expository essay represents the substance of a Lenten sermon delivered in the Colgate Memorial Chapel, March 16, 1947.

point of the temptation story if we regard it as a mere leaf from the biography of Jesus, describing how, after a great crisis in his life, he went to a lonely place to "think it through," to subject himself to a period of self-examination, or to wrestle with certain issues in regard to his messianic calling. If that were the case, we could behold this scene objectively and watch Jesus face problems which concern only the historian or the biographer who attempts to reconstruct the life of Jesus. The various temptations in the wilderness would then be interesting to the student, but essentially irrelevant to the religious life. The early church, however, took pains to preserve this story for another reason. To followers of Christ, this story belonged to the gospel because it portrayed so vividly our human situation: not only the present reality of the Kingdom of Evil and its subtle advance into the innermost sanctuary of faith, but also another present reality, intermingled with the Kingdom of Evil and manifested in Christ's victory over Satan—namely, the Kingship of God. They echoed the "good news" proclaimed by Jesus, that the Kingdom was "at hand," indeed "in your midst," as evidenced by the fact that God through his Son was breaking the grip of evil upon men's lives. "I beheld Satan fallen as lightning from heaven!" The gospel is concerned with this victory, heralded in the wilderness and decisively accomplished on Calvary.

Assuming, then, that the temptation story is relevant to the human situation, let us consider the temptations which assail the Christian, keeping in mind the description of Jesus found in Hebrews 4:15: "For we have not a high priest that cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but one that hath been *in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin.*"

I

The first temptation concerns bread and the satisfaction of physical need. Jesus' response to the Tempter is formulated in terms of the well-known passage of Scripture: "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God."

It would be impossible to find a more universal symbol of our common humanity than bread itself. The hunger for bread is the hunger for self-preservation; the demand for economic security is as natural as breathing itself. How preposterous it would be in some places in the world today to remind men that they do not live by bread alone, when every day is a precarious struggle to keep soul and body together! How appealing is the doctrine that the "economic man" is of primary importance, and that "civilization is chiefly a matter of finding something to

eat"! There is no more common temptation in our day than the temptation to turn stones into bread and base a religion upon it.

But why does the judgment of God fall upon man's struggle for bread? Why does Jesus rebuke his disciples for being anxious about the morrow, saying, "Be not anxious for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on"? Why does his judgment fall so mercilessly upon the man of wealth: "It is easier for a camel to enter in through a needle's eye than for a rich man to enter into the Kingdom of God"? The answer to these questions is to be found in the utter incompatibility of bread, regarded as a symbol of human autonomy, with faith in the God who claims man's total and utter allegiance. Bread too frequently is a symbol of man's effort to establish himself securely, to thrust himself into the center of life, to usurp the throne which belongs to Another. We have had ample witness of such "secularism" in the first half of this twentieth century, when a whole people has been deluded with the naïve assumption that the welfare of humanity depends upon the wizardry of human science. Science has become "the sacred cow of the man-in-the-street," as Paul Scherer has felicitously put it. There is an irreconcilable difference between bread, regarded as man's confidence in his own power, and bread regarded as a manifestation of divine Providence: "Give us this day our daily bread."

Notice that the evil suggested by Satan in this first temptation is not specifically moral in character. If there is anything which would be immoral, according to all human standards of justice and decency, it would be the failure to satisfy man's economic needs, to turn a deaf ear to human cries of hunger and starvation. But the evil which is suggested here is far more subtle and insidious. It is no mere social or personal vice which is proposed: it is the subtlest kind of a personal revolt against the sovereign God. In short, it is the kind of sin which is the antithesis of faith. Anxiety over food and clothing arises from the basic conviction that man's autonomy is central, and therefore brings from Jesus the censure: "O ye of little faith." Complacency in the possession of wealth is an expression of human confidence which is at odds with reliance upon God, and brings from him the judgment: "Ye cannot serve God and Mammon."

Therefore, when the Word of God is addressed to man, he is made aware of the fact that he *lives* only by faith (for "life" in the biblical sense is defined in terms of man's relationship to God). The temptation which besets the Christian is to yield to the sin which is the repudiation

of faith, to trust his own power rather than the might of him who claims complete sovereignty over human life. When confronted by this temptation, blessed is the man who is able to silence the Tempter, even for a season, saying: "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God."

II

The second temptation concerns a suggestion to jump from the pinnacle of the Temple, on the assumption that miraculous divine deliverance would come. Again the answer is stated in terms of Scripture: "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord, thy God."

Probably there is no more persistent temptation in the life of a religious person than the temptation to believe that, in the last analysis, religion exists for the benefit of man. In the realm of science the heliocentric view of the universe won out long ago, but in the realm of religion it is not easy to surrender the geocentric view that man is the center of the cosmos. The 91st Psalm, from which the Devil quotes in this story, has an alarming popularity among Christian people. Many find solace in such verses as: "A thousand shall fall at thy side, and ten thousand at thy right hand; but it shall not come nigh thee"; "There shall no evil befall thee, neither shall any plague come nigh thy tent"; and finally the specific sentence which figures in the temptation story: "He will give his angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways. They shall bear thee up in their hands, lest thou dash thy foot against a stone." Such man-centered religion flourished abundantly during the war. It found expression in numerous stories which were proclaimed by ministers and laymen alike as evidence of the efficacy of faith, as for example the testimony of a certain bombing crew, operating from an Italian base over Germany, that their plane had come through all of its missions unscathed because of the power of prayer—prayer offered by the crew before, during, and after the flight. "A thousand shall fall at thy side, and ten thousand at thy right hand, but it shall not come nigh thee."

Thoughtful Christians will readily recognize such incidents as survivals of magic. From the very first, they will insist, Christianity made its appeal not because it guaranteed safety from physical harm, but because it proclaimed that suffering was the occasion for fellowship with God. Nevertheless, the same temptation assails us in a more subtle and sophisticated form. We are persuaded to believe that the value of religion can be measured by its social effectiveness; that is, by its practical value

to man as he faces the problems of his world. Many liberal Christians are quite distressed over the fact that in modern times Christianity allegedly has suffered two major defeats: it has failed to prevent war, and it has failed to contribute effectively to the solution of social and economic problems. Certainly no one would question the relevance of the Christian gospel to human life, but that relevance cannot be measured objectively in terms of such practical tests. A further example of this type of thinking is to be found in a current best-seller in which the author champions the thesis that here in America we need to come to a new "God-idea," unstained by the sense of helplessness and despair which characterizes the Orient and Europe, and adapted to the brave, self-reliant American spirit. Even theology, it would seem, is to be measured in terms of its practical convenience! Religion thus becomes a recrudescence of the old Baal cult, in which man attempts to control his environment in his own interests. One contemporary theologian has forcefully protested against this modern idolatry in the following words:¹

A radical critique of religion has become a necessity. We need to take it to heart that "religion" is man's first and last concern with his life and destiny. It is his ultimate bid for peace and happiness in a world of flux and contingency. It is his supreme effort towards eternalization and deification. Man who eats and drinks, fights and labors, in order to sustain the life within him; who shuns disease and the sword of the enemy; who enters into community existence and abides by its laws and mores, in order to enhance his power and security; who "makes friends and influences people," in order that he may achieve mastery over his social environment; who sets out to control nature so as to avoid its rigors and to enslave its powers—this same man makes idols and practices magic, worships and serves his gods, in order that he may have power over his destiny. Thus religion, with all the praise and honor it lavishes upon the deity, concerns man's own well-being, security, and happiness.

So across the centuries Satan asks his sneering question, stated in the prologue to the Book of Job: Does a man serve God for nothing?

This is the evil which Jesus faces in his second temptation. Notice again that the sin suggested is not moral in character, for surely there is nothing immoral in the desire for safety or the ambition to cope successfully with man's environment. The sin here described is the denial of unconditional faith in God. It is the sin of idolatry, the projection of the human wish into the eternal, as though God existed to glorify man, as though religion were a mere practical technique. This is our temptation too. When confronted by this temptation, blessed is the man

¹ J. Haroutunian, *Wisdom and Folly in Religion*, Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1940, p. 45f.

who can put the Tempter aside, even for a season, saying: "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord, thy God."

III

The final temptation concerns a mountain-top glimpse of all the kingdoms of the world, and the suggestion that Jesus may have all of this authority and worldly glory by merely a slight genuflexion before Satan. Again Jesus responds in the language of Scripture, quoting a verse which forms the appropriate climax of the entire narrative: "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve."

In this instance, too, the real issue which is illuminated in the biblical story is the character of faith, and the character of faith's opposite. Again it is made clear that there is no place for self-glorification in the service of God's Kingdom. Jesus comes not as a King, seeking authority and glory, but as a Servant, humbly desiring to do the will of him that sent him. The sin suggested here is that of climbing up unto God's throne and usurping the glory which is his. In his insistence that God alone is sovereign, Jesus proved himself to be a true "son of the Covenant." Later, according to the synoptic representation, Jesus said to his disciples: "Ye know that those who are accounted to rule over the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great ones exercise authority over them. But it shall not be so among you; but whosoever would become great among you shall be your minister; and whosoever would be first among you, shall be servant of all. For the Son of man also came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many" (Mark 10:42-45, etc.).

Once again we find that we are not mere spectators of the drama in the wilderness, for at this point also we are drawn into the story's orbit of meaning and relevance. Anyone who has a sense of religious vocation will be tempted in this area, for human pride is our most vulnerable weakness, and it is here that Satan makes his deadliest attack. In an article entitled "Confessions of a Clergyman," Gerald Kennedy writes:²

Too often we stand at the center of the stage, and too much must we be in the public eye and recipients of the public's applause. . . . Many a preacher rivals Hollywood when it comes to exhibitionism. How pleasant it always is to find a great preacher who is at the same time a humble man.

Not only are we clergymen tempted by pride but we are also especially tempted by self-consciousness.

² G. Kennedy, "Confessions of a Clergyman," in *The Reader's Digest*, September, 1946, p. 47.

Kennedy then quotes a passage from *The Servant of the Word*, by Herbert Farmer of Cambridge, England:

We are sincerely aware of God and his call, but we are also, when we go into the pulpit, very conscious of ourselves being aware of God and his call. We are like those tiresome people who do genuinely admire the sunset, but when they speak of it you know at once that, in addition, they admire themselves admiring the sunset.

This confession, however, should not be restricted to the clergymen. One of the subtlest temptations which comes to any religious person is that of letting religion become the occasion for self-congratulation. How easy it is, like the Pharisee of Jesus' parable, not only to pray, but to admire ourselves praying; to worship, and watch ourselves worshiping; to offer unto God the "sacrifices" of a humble and contrite spirit, and congratulate ourselves in the same moment. Every Christian is tempted by pride and self-consciousness. When confronted with this temptation, blessed is the man who can turn the Tempter aside, at least for a season, saying, "Thou shalt worship the Lord, thy God, and him only shalt thou serve."

IV

There is, then, more than an artificial, calendar connection between the wilderness sojourn and the triumphant meaning of the Cross and Resurrection. The story of Jesus in the wilderness is a description of the human situation in which we are personally involved, and the temptations depicted are precisely those which beset the Christian. The Christian myth of the conflict between God and Satan in the present age rings true to the deepest Christian experience, for it is when God speaks his Word that man becomes conscious of the Tempter. Only when God has called a man does he become aware of the Tempter who tests his dependence upon God by making rebellion attractive and loyalty distasteful. It is only in the hour of faith that a man finds himself driven to the wilderness, there to be tempted of the Devil.

By itself the wilderness sojourn signifies despair, for it is the symbol of divine judgment upon all attempts to escape from insecurity in a world of flux—attempts which involve men in sinful pretensions. But such despair is the necessary foundation of faith, for it makes possible a genuine contrition which receives the forgiveness offered by God in Christ. The Christian then overcomes the world by his faith, for the Cross overwhelms him with an awareness of the divine *agape* which makes men "more than conquerors," even while involved in the anxieties and necessities of his

torical existence. "For I am persuaded, that neither death nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present; nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Romans 8:38, 39).

Thus for the Christian, the wilderness sojourn is inseparable from the Cross, where the power of evil received its deadliest and most decisive blow. That is why Luther's great hymn of the Reformation is so jubilant! Still our "ancient Foe," with all his craft and power, seeks to work us woe. But the Christian hopes in the Kingdom of God which, in the Cross, has already made its power and victory felt in history:

Did we in our own strength confide,
Our striving would be losing;
Were not the right Man on our side,
The Man of God's own choosing.
Dost ask who that might be?
Christ Jesus, it is he;
Lord Sabaoth his name,
From age to age the same,
And he must win the battle.

It is the victorious Christ who is presented in the temptation story, of whom we say, as did an early Christian: "In all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin."

What Is the City Doing to Christian Life?

EUGEN ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY

An analysis of the future relation between The City of Man and The City of God.

I. SUMMARY

PEOPLE IN A CITY live in a peculiar manner; and this manner is bound to become their second nature. At times, we darkly remember that we also have a first nature in virtue of which we belong to the City of God. And in these moments, we are apt to put all the blame for our own misery on the cities of men.

I shall not do so. By building cities, we have given a brilliant expression to some of our noblest faculties. The positive achievement of the city is foremost in my mind. I invite the reader to a sober assessment of our citified nature. With this civilized or citified nature the trouble is the same as with any second nature. If it is true that the City produces a highly specialized pattern of behavior, it also is true that a man's second nature is not good enough for any man. My life, it may perhaps be said, is a case study of this revolt against our second-rate nature. For I was made aware with a shock, at thirteen, of the fact that the city is merely a second-rate nature.

This shock has determined my life in all its later phases. Even when I landed in New York in 1933, its effect was continued in my prayer to land me in America, yes, but not in New York. I grew up in a metropolis of American "tempo," in Berlin, Germany. I was sent to a school to which the court and the bankers sent their sons. My class was worth many millions in dollars and in titles of the Peerage of Prussia.

At thirteen, I transferred to a strange school. This, too, was located in the heart of the city. However, I was one of only two day students. The three-hundred-years-old gymnasium was for boys from the small towns of the province of Brandenburg. Practically, it was "Winesburg, Ohio," in the middle of the Bronx. On the whole, the atmosphere was hostile to a day student; I had to defend myself for being from Berlin. And my dreams of the goodness of the countryside were shattered. But

certainly, "Winesburg" by sheer contrast opened my eyes to the second-rate character of the way of life in the metropolis and in "Winesburg" as well. Then and there, I came to know—before I ever heard the term, sociology—that second-rate things like local environment must never contain a man. And all the decisive steps of my life have been attempts to check these second-rate natures in myself or others. I do not think that this is said only in retrospect. At seventeen, when we graduated, my classmates told of their plans which all converged on a locality they already knew. I told them that no real life could be lived that way; that one could write their obituaries already beforehand and that I would not stand for such a predictable life. Thus, it came about that since 1906, I have looked for a way of allowing man's primary nature to breathe. Accordingly, I propose to make the following points:

1. What "the City" was doing to the Christian way of life, was pretty well known in, say, 1800 or 1850. However, in those days it also was known that the countryside did something to this way. The Christian way had to strike a balance between the mores of the countryside and the new ideas from the cities.
2. Today all of America is one majestic City. Industry has removed the barriers between city and country. The whole area is citified.
3. The new citified humanity, however, does divide its time between a fast and a slow way of life. The speed is realized in the centers of production, in factories, and business sections. The more restful aspects of life are represented by our suburbs.
4. We are confused because neither are the factory districts mere replicas of the old cities like Boston or Baltimore, nor are the suburbs simply the heirs of the old-time villages. The essential contrast between the new equilibrium of factory and suburb and the old equilibrium of cities and villages is often overlooked; hence the new onslaught of the City of Men on the City of God is not noticed.
5. The essential contrast lies in the fact that both, the old village and the old city, believed in their words and ideas. The factory district as well as the suburb of our time act on the assumption that nothing they think or say today may be true tomorrow. They follow the trend. They feel entitled to advertise the best sellers of one day or one year and the best sellers of tomorrow and next year as well. Both factory and suburb represent a new attitude toward the Word.
6. The Christian belief in incarnation, the universal belief in God's

creation, the right use of human reason, all three are destroyed by the new City of Men. And this is not done by accident, but by establishment. The new city can't help doing this.

7. Any new equilibrium of natural forces has always threatened the City of God. But the citizens of the latter usually wait too long before they grasp that the City of Men has taken a new shape. In this article, we shall simply try to grasp the new shape of our eternal partner, of "the world" within our own nature.

II. THE HEART OF THE TIMES

In 1800 or 1850, the Christian way of life was hampered by two enemies, by superstitions from the back hills and by new philosophies from the cities.

The Christian way of life always fights two enemies at once: the "too slow" of apathy and the "too fast" of mere curiosity. Why must this be so?

Well, the ocean's ebb and tide, and the milky way of stars need no churches. Their life cycles are heartless; their times rest with God. We men need religion because our heart's calendar does not coincide with the astronomical cycle. Astrology is nonsense. Any generation or individual or class or nation has its own calendar which clashes with all the others. Men's times conflict. Unless we build up one body of all men through the times and make God the heart of all our times, we destroy each other. The Christian way of life builds one Body of Christ through the times, with God its heart, and thus overcomes the false times of the fathers and the children. It "turns the hearts of the fathers to their children, and the hearts of the children to their parents." Or we may put it the other way round: the Christian way of life puts heart into our times and thereby creates one Body of Time. Without a heart there can be no living Body of Christ.

This Body always has the same two opponents: (1) the hasty, hurried march of time from one blind change to the other, and (2) the tendency to blind repetition, the apathy of mere routines.

The Christian way of life is opposed to change for the sake of change, and to tradition for the sake of tradition. It thereby obeys the divine Will as it stands revealed in the great calamities and catastrophes. For who can doubt that, for instance, the last two world wars have called back the human race into the universal rhythm from which the pride of nationalism had tried to stray?

Before the industrial revolution, the natural function of the old city made sense. The countryside inclined to be superstitious. Down to the Russian Revolution, the peasants of eastern Europe observed the rites of Isis and Osiris. "Neither the Christian missionaries nor the emperors of Rome had scratched more than the surface of their lives" (Frazer). Super-stitions are outmoded ways of life. Rural life preferred such folkways. As a natural check on this one trend of our nature, the city stood for new ideas. Here, new philosophies could arise, new ideas be sown, and change could exert pressure in the form of new fashions, new sensations. Between sensations of a new character and superstitions of an old type, the old Adam in all of us muddled through. We all are one half the rooted plant and one half the roving animal; for us, the villages stressed the vegetative rhythm of the recurrent seasons, the cities procured the acceleration of changes.

We, however, have abolished this time-honored division of labor. We no longer have peasants. In a mutual embrace, country and city have engendered the industrialized world of factories and suburbs. From the remote corners of the countryside, the raw materials which the machines transform are taken; the scientific processes by which they are exploited hail from the city. On the other hand, the rhythm of the suburbs seems similar to that of the countryside, but the mind of the people in the suburbs are all trained in the most modern ways of production.

Hence it is not true that our factory districts are identical with the old cities; for this, they are far too close to nature. Neither are the suburbs simply the heirs of the villagers; the people of Scarsdale are too close to Manhattan; who could be more sophisticated?

One similarity between the routines in the old peasant homes and the homes of our suburban commuters cannot be denied. It consists in a distinctly more relaxed, more leisurely approach to the time schedule than either the old city or the people in the Loop can afford. But both, the suburb and the factory, have some new relation to human language which was unknown to either the old peasant or the old citizen of Boston.

The peasant was superstitious in that he repeated the sacred words of the past forever and forever. And when I go to our own village church, one out of three in town, with from fifteen to twenty others, I am super-stitious, that is, hanging on against hope. For, this handful of people certainly is not the salt of the earth or the undivided Church of Christ in our town. But there is nothing wrong with the service

which we observe. Our words are not superstitious. The situation is outmoded; that's all. Now, however, turn to the suburb. At the outset, in the new suburb provision will be made for all the denominations—Catholic, Jewish, Protestant, minor sects. No one faith is absolute in claims or expectations. Faiths, in the plural, are a Sunday affair. The suburb is redundant with private activities all of which are perfectly harmless and without consequence. The best book for the suburb is *Alice in Wonderland*. The doggerel is its most pertinent poetry. Dante is funny in the suburb because in the suburb nobody can be exiled for his ideals. In fact, everybody has ideals there and they all differ. People read voraciously in the suburb. But in the old village, they only had one single book through the centuries. Hence, the villagers would actually believe in what the book said. But a suburban reads the review of a new book before he commits himself. The words preached and read and rhymed in the suburb, all are uttered tentatively and in good spirits. By good spirits, we mean without giving offense to anybody. And that is a good way of saying, without any effect on anybody. For the man who is never misunderstood to the point of offending can never have said anything important. Important words always give offense. They make a difference. The Holy Spirit is not a "good Spirit" but the better Spirit!

Now compare the old city and the new Inner Sanctum of Simon and Schuster. The old city gave birth to philosophies like Spinoza's or Schopenhauer's. Their newfangled ideas disturbed the peace. The idea required partisanship, decision, commitment. Because these ideas created a whole movement, like transcendentalism, ideas made martyrs. Mind you, many of those new ideas were cockeyed and merely new. I do not think that in themselves they were better than ours. I do contend that our ancestors stood by them in a very different manner. The wicked new ideas of the city were persecuted and they were introduced by people who believed in the importance of making a grave decision.

This relation of the writers and publishers to their own ideas is impossible when you write advertising copy, or editorials for a paper whose political convictions you do not share. If a Gallup poll can offer the publishers and authors a poll of what will sell, the last camouflage is dropped. Nobody any longer pretends that he is in conscience bound to write as he writes. He eagerly admits that he is going to write what pays.

The most striking difference between the old and the new relation

to the Word deserves to become the theme of a book. The title I planned for it was "The Triumph of the Witches." I wanted to show that the same type of people who formerly were burned as sorcerers soon may run our society in the shape of psychologists and economists and sociologists, and may put everybody who speaks only out of conviction into their carefully padded lunatic asylums. The modern mind declares anybody who keeps from writing for money to be a fanatic or "nuts." An athlete and brilliant college graduate who had joined the old CCC in order to reform it, volunteered after Lend-Lease for the Marines. He was rejected by the army psychologist as a lunatic simply because no "normal" fellow could go from college to CCC. If he had followed the next trend, that would have been sane, even if it had consisted in ruining his health by cocktails and venery.

The new majestic City America, in other words, has developed a new attitude toward the new ideas and the sacred traditions of the race. Everybody is noncommittal. A marriage consecrated by the Cardinal of Boston ended in divorce a few years later. From the Inner Sanctum of a publisher, we may expect every year another creed and another philosophy and another policy.

Words have lost their meaning. Names have lost their appeal. The publishers instead of consulting the Gallup poll should ask themselves if books did not depend for their very existence during the last four hundred years on some strange identity of the speaker and the words he spoke, and whether probably the time for books is over as this identity is lost.

If and since we all ride the wave of perpetual future change, no one single change can ask for our devotion or investment. The business district always has its tongue in its cheek. And in the suburb, we can't ever get excited as this would make us unwelcome at the country club. (The other day I read of a Country Club Church!) And now let me give three examples and then be silent. In these three examples the new City of Men has altered our relation to Christ the Word, to God the Creator, to Man, the image of God.

III. THE PERMANENT WAVE OF THE FUTURE

In the January issue of the *Reader's Digest*,¹ Anne Morrow Lindbergh gave a write-up of her most unforgettable character. Speaking of his death, she said, "The flesh had become word." The author of *The*

¹ 1947, p. 174.

Song of Bernadette, Franz Werfel, a man whom you might suspect to have religious insight, printed in his last book, "At the end, we shall say that we have created God." Huxley and the evolutionists explain the so-called higher by the lower, man by hydrogen, and God by stomach ulcers.

Let us take the undaunted heroine of the wave of the future first.

Mrs. Lindbergh's sentence, "The flesh had become word," rivals the sentence from John: The Word has become flesh. Obviously where people clothe their beloved for the burial themselves, or where the picture of the Crucified is still looked upon in faith, such nonsense would be unprintable. The corpse gives off a stench. This, in the suburb, is hidden. So, the five words, "The flesh had become word," did not arouse indignation. That it was blasphemy was not felt. This brings out the fact that the modern city denies the very possibility of blasphemy.

The modern city does not rest until the last sentence of our faith has been matched by a brilliant worldly parallel. This is achieved by changing the direction of the faithful statement. By the change of direction it becomes witty. In "The Word has become flesh," the spirit of God descends. In "The flesh had become word," the human mind is distilled from the body and ascends. Similarly in "God created man," Moses looked in one direction, and in "We have created God," Werfel looked in exactly the opposite one. In the sentence, "In the image of God created he him," all the things below men, oceans and stars, mountains and valleys, are later than God's vision of man. They lead up to him. But with Huxley, the earlier explains the later, the mountains and the molecules evolve man in their image.

All city wit, however, depends for its remarks on the existence of the treasures of faith. Frank Lloyd Wright's son could not have written his biography *My Father Who Is On Earth* without stealing from the Lord's Prayer. Neither Mrs. Lindbergh nor Werfel nor Huxley could have said what they said unless the reverse had been believed by all men for thousands of years.

We discover: *the perpetual waves of the future are of a secondary nature.* They exploit the treasures of the universal faith of mankind. It took 5,000 years before St. John could exclaim, "The Word has become flesh." It took 3,500 years before Moses could joyfully shout, "In the image of God, he created Man." It took 7,000 years before Niels Bohr could explain the constellation in one atom by the order of the solar system or before Joseph Wittig could explain each individual soul as

the replica of the whole church in all its offices and branches. The statements of faith always take time. The exploitation of such gold mines of truth by the city wit takes next to no time.

As we have blown up the forests of millions of years in our steam locomotives within one century, and as we are exploiting the oil deposits of endless periods of geology within this quarter of a century, so the city explodes the accumulated wealth of millenniums of common faith for one magazine article. I am doing it myself at this moment. We all live in this city where the clever mind mints the gold bars of eternal truth into cash.

However, we now are in a position to define with precision the laws under which the City operates.

1. The City exploits the oil wells, the coal mines, the treasures of faith by a change of direction. Lower explains higher, the flesh ascends into the word, my maker is said to be my makeshift.

2. The operation of the brilliant mind seems to be nothing but the act of one day. This is not so. Two ranges of time, one excessively long, one excessively short, are brought together in the operation.

3. The perverted citified statement always remains indebted to the sentence of faith which it perverts, for its creative substance.

That there is a "Higher" in this arbitrary and chaotic universe, that there is a "Creator," and that there is one phase for the word and another phase for the flesh, these substantial truths had lived and had been believed before the direction could be turned about. But of this third law, I would like to say one more word before leaving it to the reader how he is going to restore within his own accounting the balance between the City of Men and the City of God.

May I be pedantic and simply print the sentences side by side:

The Word has become flesh.

Man is in the image of God.

God created man.

The flesh has become word.

The lower evolves the higher.

Man shall have created God.

The word which comes out of Mr. Smith's flesh may be anything—a joke or an abomination, a blessing or a curse; there are innumerable unforgettable characters. The sentence on the right side is pluralistic. The sentence on the left side is singular; it has happened once for ever, and if it is true, we all live in this One Word's Christian Era; if it is not true, there is no hope for peace whatever.

The God whom men are going to create according to the poor fool Werfel may be a monstrosity, asking for the slaying of our first-born.

The God of righteousness and mercy, however, although he cannot prevent the city people from destroying themselves within three or four generations, keeps the human race alive. "The lower evolves the higher" is a naïve theft of the term "high" from the left side of our account. In pure evolution, the word "high" does not exist. The ape is later or more complex than the jellyfish; he is in no way higher. "High" does not come in except by a comparison between God and his angels and men and stones, from the peak downwards.

Whenever the human mind has achieved this perversion of direction, it feels safe. From the corner where the lower explains the higher, where the flesh becomes the word, where we create God, no orders have to be feared for our free will. Sentences like those of Werfel, Lindbergh, Huxley, dissolve our dependence on some imperative truth. For truth is valid only when the singular of a unique demand here and now is heard by the "cross-over" which you and nobody else in the world embodies; if you receive the word into your flesh you admit that the higher overrules the lower and that the image of God may be impressed on the physically ugly, the mentally fearful, the socially underprivileged because it never, never, never shall evolve from the bottom up but always shall descend from the top down.

The little churches today in our suburbs often form part of the evolutionary city of men. The innocent young man in my church one day received new members of the congregation. He had us sing the grand hymn: "The Church's one foundation is Jesus Christ our Lord." And then, with his eternal smile of unruffled suburban kindness, he continued: "Today, we found the Church." He did not even take notice of this change of direction and everybody in the congregation was far too polite to do so.

The City of America does in a new and peculiar manner that which the cities of men always have done. This minister made the same mistake which mars the three analyzed quotations. The reader may catch himself in this act each time that he replaces the word "a" by "the," or the plural "men" by the singular "Man." As this is a kind of master key to the worldly mind's operations, I recommend this observation. It's a lie detector. Werfel's formula that Man creates God, is false because the tragedy of men is that they can never hope to become MAN except by the grace of God. God must have given us a chance to form ONE SINGLE MAN before we may reveal God. *The City of Man* was the attractive title of a book ten years ago. It was written by the

leading liberals. The fallacy was in the naïve use of the singular *Man*. With old Homer, it still was notorious that there were "many cities of men"; in this honest manner, the *Odyssey* begins. Our liberals jump to the conclusion that we can build a city of Man without God blessing our work. In the same manner, our young minister might have preached on the humble endeavor to found today "one" church, in the image of God's foundation. But he jumped to the liberal conclusion that "the" Church was man-made. And it is not obvious that when Mrs. Lindbergh's hero died, not "the" Word had become flesh but some word, one word among many had been added to the confusion of tongues?

Whenever something indefinite, the "any" or the "a," is exalted into the One by mere cerebration, without personal commitment and sacrifice, it always betrays the humanistic mentality. In this act, the world takes the place of God. We daily commit this act. The great Pope Gregory VII fought this surrender; he called it simony. Luther fought it; he called it indulgences. Julien Benda fought it; he called it *La Trahison des Clercs*. The city of God which fights it will live to the thousandth generation; and the city of men which does not fight it, will have vanished before the fourth generation.

When the minds cease from this mental fight, our bodies get involved in wars, our property in economic crises, our souls in sadistic racial hatreds.

But will anybody fight? Is there anybody left who can fight? The reader who has followed us thus far has a right to say that the new city is omnipotent and therefore cannot be held in check by any Christian way of life. Indeed the City of Man of our time is so formidable because it does include the peasant and the philosopher, between which the old Christian could find his way. The new city dweller is a fusion of both these extremes. This city dweller is repetitive like the old peasant and he has brilliant ideas like the former philosophers. The result is that he is a man who *repeats sensations*. While in former centuries the peasant used to repeat ancient lore and the philosopher created new ideas, the modern city dweller incessantly has one sensation succeed the other in stereotyped repetition. He has the superstition of believing in a breathless chain of daily news. Every single one of them differs; however, they are repetitive as they all are crazes without consequences. And it cannot be said that waves of the future in endless succession are more intelligent than the endless turning of the prayer mills in a Hindu village.

To fight this new "superstition of enlightenment," no army exists.

Our ministers are numbed by this new alignment of forces. They have not "studied" this situation.

The one man who saw this unholy alliance of speed and superstition early is Friedrich Nietzsche. He mourned the death of a living faith. In his despair, he mixed a drink for the dead souls of our peasant-philosophers. His phial contains a counter-elixir, an antidote against this obsession with sensations in succession. Nietzsche volunteered for the only role which can impress such a city dweller because it is the extreme role of this same city dweller's existence. Nietzsche undertook to play the Antichrist. Nietzsche's Zarathustra does professionally that which Simon and Schuster and Mrs. Anne Morrow Lindbergh do only occasionally: he replaces every act or scene from the New Testament with one of Zarathustra's vintage. Nietzsche made himself into the Antichrist to resuscitate in the poor breathless souls the power to distinguish the spirits, that is to distinguish between panting and breathing again. He took the devil's dress lest God remain dead. We have this from himself. This poem suffices to prove that he knew what he was doing and that we do him the greatest honor if we accept him as the antichrist; Antichrist is an Ersatz Christ, and the city's way of life is Ersatz.

The mind of the city has reached its insuperable absolute in Nietzsche. And against this foil the cross leaps forward with renewed vigor. The city annihilates all ways of fruitful incarnation. Nietzsche replaces Christ. And behold, never is Christ more redblooded and interesting than after you have tried Nietzsche. The Antichrist can stem the very waves of the future to which our ministers and Christian fronts and peasant-philosophers succumb. By outdoing all city wits, Nietzsche has staked out the ultimate. The last word of the city: Nietzsche has said it long before anybody who may come in the future. I stand not alone in this belief. But I did not know how literal my agreement with others was on this point. Indeed, this article was sent to the editor before I found the comrade in arms, Gerhard Brom, in the *Nederlandsch Royal Academy of Amsterdam, Transactions of 1946*. He says that Nietzsche's Antichrist has reduced the New City of Man *ad absurdum*. "Christ walking among man's children, is the Word which has become flesh. But Zarathustra is the flesh which has become Word. This is a parody. It is the weapon of the powerless who wants to make himself big and who remains literature. . . ."

A succession of sensations still is a succession of mere sensations for every moment. And the Christian way of life still is and will be a succession of apostles to each generation.

Christianity and Reason

MACK B. STOKES

Too many Christian theologians share the "major tendency of our time," that of belittling reason—but Christianity is a reasonable faith resting on its own special facts.

I

THE PRESENT unhappy drift toward irrationalism in theology is a symptom of a disease which has plagued the church for the beginning. It is one of the most persistent expressions in history of a deep-seated and fatal suspicion of man's reason. And its implications for the future of Christianity are not of the sort that give hope. For if our religion is not reasonable, how can it stand? If our religion blinks at reason in its own household, how can it champion the cause of sanity in the world at large? In man's struggle to free his mind from the tyranny of convention and prejudice, the church has played an ambiguous and miserable role. Thus we see even in holy places many tragic instances of the truth: those who trample upon intelligence at home are not likely to exalt it abroad.

We come upon the clearest manifestation of this irrationalism in Christianity, when we consider the utterances on the subject of reason and revelation. It is here that the basic theological foundation of the faith is laid. And the major tendency of our time is toward an authority other than reason. Some say the authority is "beyond reason," others that it is "above reason," still others speak of a "higher rationality." Whatever the terms used, it is not reason that rules even in the matters of truth in Christianity.¹ So say many of the most outspoken theologians of our day.

Despite the flood of books in recent years treating the subject of reason and revelation, we find little that has not already been expressed more ably by our predecessors. Those writers that are putting Christian beliefs on a basis other than reason are simply expressing the prevailing view of the church throughout the ages. They insist upon the familiar distinction between natural knowledge and revealed knowledge. The latter is not contrary to reason, but beyond it. At this point there

¹ Everyone knows by now that reason is not a principle of action but of understanding and guidance. Hence, it is not to be regarded as authoritative except in matters of truth.

is a notable kinship between the Protestant and the Roman Catholic theologians. But it might be added that the Protestant thinkers have been more ready to belittle man's intelligence than have the followers of Thomas Aquinas. This, however, cannot be said of Emil Brunner in his recent work, *Revelation and Reason*. For there he expresses a view similar to that of the distinguished pupil of Albertus Magnus. While he goes into detail to give reason a respectable place, he still comes out with the old familiar story about natural and revealed truths.²

When we seek to understand why organized Christianity has set itself against reason in regard to certain central doctrines, we do not have far to look. The separation between reason and revelation has been viewed as essential because, on the one hand, the church could not deny the validity of reason in some areas; and on the other, she has wanted desperately to guard her own special doctrines against the hands of the philosophers or anyone on the outside who would tamper with them. There has always been the practical need for doctrinal stability. The church has not been able to find a clear justification for her most precious beliefs on a rational basis, and hence has shut the door quickly and tightly against those who would allow reason to hold sway in the *sanctum sanctorum* of theology. Thus far and no further shalt thou come!

And, indeed, when we look at the efforts of the philosophers to justify the vital beliefs of our religion, we can understand the church's refusal to open the door to them. For the attempts to provide a rational justification of the distinctive Christian doctrines have been in the main unconvincing. True, the philosophers have been able to demonstrate the inadequacy of materialism. They have shown that there is some ultimate spiritual being underlying this vast universe. All this is clear gain for religion. For it is a world-view wherein Christianity can be at home. But what about the most cherished dogmas of the church? What about God as our Father? What about the Incarnation? What about the forgiveness of sins? What about the Holy Spirit? These are the lifeblood of Christianity. Out of them has come that practice of prayer and charity which marks the true disciple. Has the philosopher helped much in justifying these doctrines? Has he aided in bringing them to light?

It is here that misgivings set in. I would not minimize the work of the philosopher. For I view it as one of the most needed in our time. All honor to him for what he has done, and especially for what

² Cf. Emil Brunner, *Revelation and Reason*, Westminster Press, 1946, pp. 212-213.

he ought to be doing! But is it not true that in most instances when the philosophers touch Christianity it begins to wither? They sit down at their desks and figure out what the creed ought to be from a philosophical standpoint. But, alas, too many of them leave untouched the storehouse of centuries of Christian experience. Thus, when the calculations are complete, they present us with a group of beliefs which, however appealing philosophically, are religiously sterile. And by this fact are they known to be at war with reality. Perhaps these men get a few eccentric followers who go along not because of the religious values so much as for the intellectual and moral appeal they make. God is no longer our loving Father in whose eyes we are objects of a tender care. He is now the ultimate metaphysical principle. And the practical result is that God turns out to be everything in general and nothing in particular. It is just this that has brought on the outbursts in religious circles against Hegelian philosophy. Religion demands a God who can do specific things. This philosophy leaves us with a God who does everything on a general scale, but who does not touch us at the point of our crying needs. This is not to reflect on Hegel, the philosopher. It is merely to urge that the religious life cannot get much nourishment from his offerings. Imagine saintliness growing out of them! The religious pilgrim who walks over the hills of Hegelianism will find them cold and rocky and bare.³ And his tendency will be to stop praying.

Or suppose we follow certain other philosophers who conceive of God as the best that is in man. God is not a being beyond us and above us whose resources are available to us. He is rather our ideals, our visions, our wisdom, our affections for one another. What does this do to prayer? It kills it. It turns it into meditation and aspiration. These have value, but they are not what prayer means to the Christian. So the religious seeker picks up John Dewey's *A Common Faith* and drops it quickly because it is too cold. It leaves his soul untouched. It does not fire the flaming desire for goodness within his breast, nor does it quench the thirst for some ultimate meaning in his passing career. Here again, this is not to say that the book is without value from a philosophical standpoint, but that it is religiously barren.

The simple truth is that whatever puts a damper on prayer suffocates living religion—and by this fact ignores the testimony of Christian experience throughout the centuries. As George Tyrrell has put it:

³ Far be it from me to say that we cannot learn from Hegel. It is my belief that we can and should. I am here talking about the religious seeker and not the philosophical enquirer.

Any rationalist explanation that would make prayer nonsensical, or would encourage laxity, or would make havoc of the ordinary sane and sensible religious notions of the faithful, is *ea ipso* condemned as not squaring with the facts.⁴

Thus, beliefs that lead us to expect nothing definite to happen in us by the workings of a power not ourselves, that cause us to place our confidence in human effort and ingenuity alone, stand only because we close our minds to the facts. They reveal to us how much our misbelieving can blind us. For when we believe that nothing will happen in prayer, we exclude the possibility of verification. For we are no longer willing to put to the test the life of prayer. This does not prove we were right. It merely locks us in a closet and confirms us in our ignorance. Seeing no light, we adjust ourselves to the darkness and call ourselves children of the light. For God has lost his vital touch. We no longer expect anything of him. He is there, but that is about all we can say. The incentive to pray is gone (though perhaps theoretically a place for prayer remains); the urge to repent is lost; the sense of definite works of grace in us vanishes.

If it is true that the philosophers for the most part have not given us a convincing analysis of the relation between reason and revelation, it is also true that the authoritarian theologians have failed in their attempts. The view that revelation is beyond reason—a theory stated with varying emphases by Thomas Aquinas, Luther, Calvin, and their contemporary disciples⁵—secures a place for prayer and vital religion at the expense of reason. It does violence to man's intelligence, and in practice opens the way to almost any sort of extravagance in the world of ideas. It thus adds weight to that heavy burden which the church has so frequently put upon man's mind to keep it from rising to the ascendancy in matters of truth. Indeed, some theologians are not content merely to insist upon truths that are beyond reason. They urge that we must renounce our intelligence when we stand before God. For, they tell us, it is just that power of "free thought," of "private judgment," that must be emptied in order that the divine grace may flow into our spirits. This, they declare, is the last citadel of man's pride.⁶ But how could the Lord of Truth wish us to give up our right and power of private judgment? It is he that endowed us with it. What he wants

⁴ Through *Scylla and Charybdis*, Longmans, Green, and Company, 1907, p. 96.

⁵ It is important to fix clearly in our minds the thought that the position here referred to is a theory and not a demonstrated belief.

⁶ Cf. M. C. D'Arcy, in *Revelation*, edited by John Baillie and Hugh Martin, The Macmillan Company, 1938, p. 216.

is that we use it in subservience to him, to understand and know him as he truly is, and to serve him wisely in this life. Alas, that strange fascination of the human spirit with the unqualified sovereignty of God and the corresponding insignificance of man has here manufactured its hideous masterpiece.

How long are we going to be content to hear people say that our religion is irrational or nonrational, and that one of the requirements for discipleship is that we renounce our rationality? Why has not the lie been seen all these centuries? Why do we not understand once and for all that if Christianity is not reasonable it cannot stand? For it must be our considered judgment that to believe in God and to consecrate our hearts and heads to him is one of the surest marks of wisdom. If we rest our beliefs upon the arbitrary dictates of a revelation that no one can justify, where are we better off than a man of any other religion who might with equal justice make precisely the same claims for his faith? Since reason and evidence are not capable of determining what is revealed and what is not, the Mohammedan theologian has as much authority for asserting the revelation of God to be complete in Mohammed and the Koran as the Christian theologian has for claiming that the final revelation of God is in Jesus Christ and the Bible. But this is not what the latter are willing to admit. They insist that there is no doubt that we have the only true and final disclosure of God. Nay, further, where is our advantage at this point over such figures as Hitler and multitudes of his followers? For theirs, too, was a claim for a faith above and beyond reason. For example, in a speech delivered at Nuremberg, September 13, 1935, Hitler told his listeners:

. . . . to every single one of you at some time has occurred the reflection that it is no subtlety of the intellect, but rather an inner voice that has at some time given its commands to every one of you. Reason must have dissuaded you from coming to me; faith alone gave you the command.⁷

Again, in a speech of March 12, 1938, in Linz, Austria, he said:

If Providence once called me forth from this town to be the leader of the Reich, it must, in so doing, have given to me a commission, and that commission could be only to restore my dear homeland to the German Reich. I have believed in this commission, I have lived and fought for it, and I believe I have now fulfilled it. . . .

I know not on what day you will be summoned, I hope it will not be far distant. Then you must make good your pledge with your own confession of faith.
. . . .⁸

⁷ *My New Order*, edited by Raoul de Roussy de Sales, Reynal & Hitchcock, 1941, pp. 337-338.

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 337-338

I do not want to be misunderstood. I would not for a moment liken any of our authoritarian theologians to Hitler and his diabolical works. For the most part, they have been tireless opponents of the Nazis. But is there not a basic similarity in the method of justifying their respective beliefs? And do not similar dangers lurk therein, namely, the danger of entertaining unfounded and irresponsible beliefs, and that of encouraging the habit of laxity in matters of belief? In all events, both groups claim an authority higher than reason. Hence, in neither case is there anything to be said except "yea" or "nay." The most persistent voice, or the loudest, wins the day.

We are left with the firm conviction that the authoritarian position has its strength in the vigor and religious appeal with which it is stated, together with the *assumed* grounds of belief which are present in the minds of both the theologians and their readers. How otherwise can sensible people be asked to choose between Christian beliefs and those of some other religious or political creed? It is in the theater of fact that our doctrines stand or fall. Whatever the theories urged, however, ingeniously, if the central affirmations of our religion betrayed those needs and interests of life out of which they came, if they failed to awaken and nourish the life of charity, we should be forced to renounce them. Emil Brunner seems to be aiming at this (though unhappily he abandons the autonomy of reason in religious thought⁹) when he declares: ". . . it can certainly be shown that the truth of revelation possesses its own logic, and that the fact of revelation also possesses its own facts."¹⁰ But the thought is left at loose ends. So we press for an answer to the question: How are we to think of Christianity as rational?

II

We gain the requisite insight here by following the lead of two clues. The first is that of a clear understanding of the words: "rational" or "reasonable," "irrational," and "nonrational." The second clue is given us when we see the distinctive role of Christian experience in our theological beliefs. To these we now turn.

What do we mean when we say a belief is rational or reasonable? We mean that we perceive its cogency. We see that in the light of the premises or evidences presented the belief is justified. There are two types of rational belief: one that rests upon strictly logical implication,

⁹This is unfortunate because reason that is not autonomous is not reason at all, for it is under the sway not of logic nor of fact but of preconceived ideas or of passions.

¹⁰*Revelation and Reason*, pp. 212-213.

as in mathematics (e.g., $2+2=4$), and another that rests upon evidences or facts of experience. The first of these has been illustrated from time immemorial by the syllogism:

All men are mortal.
Socrates is a man.
Therefore, Socrates is mortal.

We perceive the cogency of the conclusion because it is implied in the premises. If these are accepted, the conclusion follows with mathematical certainty. It is merely a matter of how we use terms. There is a story about a priest who during a pleasant occasion with his friends happened to say that his first confessor was a murderer. Presently, a man entered who was a stranger to all there but the priest. Upon seeing the latter, he declared within the hearing of the others: "Remember me! I am the first man ever to confess before you." The secret was no more. For everyone there knew that this man was a murderer. It was simply a case of the conclusion being implied in the premises. So is it with all questions of purely formal reasoning. The rationality consists in the perception of logical implication.

Very few of our beliefs, however, are of the sort mentioned above. When we move into the realm of life and death and destiny, our beliefs concern matters of fact. And here rationality consists not merely in the perception of formal implication, but rather in the perception that those beliefs are justified by the evidences of experience. We say: "The sun is shining," "Babe Ruth hit sixty home runs in one season," "Stalin is at the head of the U.S.S.R.," "The United States is a democracy," "God answers prayer." These statements do not come at the end of some syllogism. And yet they may be perfectly rational or reasonable. Wherein does their rationality consist? It consists in the perception of cogency, the perception that they are justified by the facts of experience. This is the case with all of our vital Christian beliefs such as the reality of God, the Incarnation, the Holy Spirit, the forgiveness of sins. They concern reality, they deal in facts; hence, they are justified, if at all, only before the tribunal of experience. And therein resides their rationality.

What do we mean when we say that a belief is irrational? An irrational belief is one that does not follow from the premises or evidences presented.

A nonrational belief is one entertained without regard to evidences,

but which is neither self-contradictory nor inconsistent with known facts. Since theologians sometimes imagine that they fortify their positions by calling them nonrational rather than irrational, it is well to consider what analysis reveals on this subject. When we think of rationality in terms of the formal implication referred to above, we see that beliefs may be nonrational. For example, the belief that there are people on Mars is not self-contradictory, nor does it conflict with known facts. The same holds for a belief that there are diamonds 3,000 miles below the earth's crust. But what have we gained by this? Where is the glory of saying our Christian beliefs are nonrational? In precisely the same sense the belief that there are people on Mars is nonrational. Does this establish anything? No. What we require is the knowledge of reality, not the bare conceivability of a thought.

So we must leave the realm of purely logical implication and enter that of fact. And here there is no such thing as a nonrational belief. For either we perceive the cogency of a belief in view of the evidences or we do not. If we do not perceive its cogency, the belief is not nonrational but irrational. Thus we conclude that nonrational beliefs about matters of fact are actually irrational. To put the thought concretely, Thomas Aquinas said that our belief in the Incarnation is neither rational nor irrational, but nonrational. But if there are no evidences for that affirmation, it is irrational.¹¹ For it concerns the world of fact. And though there is nothing self-contradictory about it, that does not remove the curse attending a belief without grounds.

This brings us to our second clue, namely, the one provided by an understanding of the distinctive role of Christian experience in our theological beliefs. Christian doctrines have grown out of experience. They are like a tree with many branches whose trunk is firmly imbedded in and constantly nourished by the soil of the devotional life. Theological formulations are efforts on the part of the church to express what the great discoverers in religion have felt and described. What the saints first experienced, the theologians later attempted to state systematically. Wrench these beliefs from the earth that brought them forth, and, having no root, they wither and die. We might as soon study a leaf without the tree, a raindrop without the cloud, a whitecap without the wave, a full-blown sail without the wind, as to view the vital dogmas

¹¹ I would not for a moment assert that there are no evidences for the Incarnation. The point here is merely to insist that we fall into *irrationality* when we ignore them and imagine we are safe behind the word "nonrational."

of the church apart from the experiences that gave them birth. George Tyrrell summarizes this thought admirably when he says:

It is the Saints in virtue of their sanctity who have been the chief authors of this unfolding of the spirit of Christ and consequently, though perhaps indirectly, of those doctrinal expressions in which that unfolding has embodied itself.¹²

Christian beliefs were not the product of curiosity. Rather were they forged hot off the anvil of life. Men in desperation have cried out for help and found it. Men under the frightful hold of temptation, powerless to stand, have hurled themselves before the Ultimate only to find their strength renewed. Men pressed down by the icy hand of meaninglessness and futility have brought their weary souls before what they hoped was God, and they have heard his still small voice.

It is not even accurate to say that our beliefs have come out of the Bible. For experience preceded the truths of the Scriptures. The psalmist did not first read the twenty-third Psalm and then come to know that the Lord was his Shepherd. St. Paul did not first sit down and figure out what set of beliefs would enable him to square his life with spiritual reality. Nor did he start out with the advantage of reading the eighth chapter of Romans. He was awakened by a powerful experience, one preceded by various events in his life, but one which changed his course and set him on the way to righteousness and peace. After that experience he had a new theology. What the Christians talked about made sense. What before was nonsense or foolishness now became the very heart of wisdom. What he fought with anger and bitterness he now championed with a passion. The deep and unsatisfied thirst for righteousness at last found a fountain able to meet the need. The gnawing hunger for an absolute goodness had now been confronted by the Bread of Life. Did St. Paul believe in the Fatherhood of God? Why? Because he felt within him the working of the unseen Power of Goodness in whose presence he cried, Abba, Father. Did he believe in the Deity of Christ? Why? Because in contemplating that majestic life, even against many of his most pressing desires, he felt its power. The belief of the apostles that God was in Christ now came to life in the soil of St. Paul's experience. And he, too, proclaimed the unsearchable riches of God in Christ Jesus.

When we say that a Christian doctrine is reasonable, then, we do not mean that it has been put through the refrigerating process of spec-

¹² *Lex Orandi*, Longmans, Green, and Company, 1904, p. 61.

ulative thought. Nor do we mean that it must be stated in the most precise technical language. It may not be stated at all and yet *be* rational. It may be symbolically expressed, as in the phrase, "the lamb slain from the foundation of the world," and still be reasonable. For, as we have seen, by "rational" or "reasonable" we mean simply the perception of cogency. The religious man perceives the cogency of his faith when he confronts the witnesses of others before him and about him, and also when he reflects upon his own experiences. No surer foundation can be laid than that, and to the true disciple no further argument is required. For to him nothing is more convincing than that inner witness which says: "Whereas I was once blind I now see." He does not have to await some new discoveries in science to go ahead. For whatever new ideas may float upon the everchanging sea of human thought and custom, the Christian can be assured that his faith, being firmly rooted in experience, will remain secure.¹³ He does not rest his case upon the facts of the various sciences. He accepts these, but he recognizes that in each area of belief there are evidences pertinent to the subjects contemplated. And his claim is that the distinctive evidences of Christian experience demonstrate the rationality of his religion.

This is no special claim made on the part of religion. There are selections of data in every field of thought. For example, if we want to learn what Russia's foreign policy is, we do not go to an observatory and study the stars. If we want to learn the nature of cancer, we do not investigate the coral growths on the bottom of the sea. If we want to learn about the Christian God, we do not ask what the scientists have discovered about atomic energy. It matters not what they find; our belief that God is and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him remains unshaken if it is grounded in those facts of experience which are relevant to the subject. It is just this that gives significance to that notable phrase: "The autonomous validity of religious experience."¹⁴ For religion stands upon its own grounds. To be sure, there is strong support for the spiritual outlook upon the universe in the history and philosophy of the world. This we would not belittle. But its place in justifying Christianity is secondary. James Ward saw this when he wrote of the saints: ". . . those lives are perhaps chief among the

¹³ I make no plea here for a mind closed to new theological formulations and to new revelations. But those beliefs that have throughout the ages been true to religious experience contain a core of validity that seems to me unchanging.

¹⁴ Cf. A. C. Knudson, *The Validity of Religious Experience*, Abingdon Press, 1937, p. 174.

evidences for Christianity.”¹⁵ And yet, they have been persistently ignored by leading theologians throughout the centuries.

Christianity has its own special facts upon which it securely rests. If there is a great number of “intellectuals” and others who shut the door against such facts, we need not be deeply disturbed in our faith. For Christian beliefs are not based upon the number of trained minds that accept or reject them. Indeed, one lone believer might be reasonable against the cries of the whole world. The belief in the law of gravity was no less true when it lived in the mind of a solitary thinker than it was when multitudes of others came to accept it. This is no plea for anyone to believe what he likes. Rather is it an effort to show where our beliefs live, and wherein they are justified. They live in the private mind, and therein alone is their cogency perceived.

To the man who has learned to pray, nothing can demonstrate more clearly the workings of God than the fact that his life has been lifted up and strengthened and enriched by an “unseen power of goodness” beyond himself. The humblest Christian may be perfectly reasonable in his faith even though he may not be able to state wherein it is rational. He perceives the cogency but cannot explain it. Like the sailor who knows the wind and the sea and the clouds but is at a loss to present a rationale of his predictions, so may it be with the religious man. The “intellectual,” in his efforts to devise a reasonable statement of religion, may in fact be farther from the truth than an untutored follower of the Lord Jesus Christ. By comparison he may seem like one lecturing on navigation while the ship is sinking. The claim of the Christian is that whatever the language used, whether symbol or figure, there is an unseen order of reality to which that language truly (though inadequately) refers. His affirmations are those of life. Therefore, they are tested only in life. We can neither establish nor destroy in the armchair what has been verified in the laboratory of the human heart.

¹⁵ *Essays in Philosophy*, Cambridge (England): The University Press, 1927, p. 351.

On Cutting Ice

LOCKHART AMERMAN

Why are there no effective "fishers of men" such as were the great preachers of fifty years ago? Suggestions are offered for meeting the changed situation.

THERE IS inevitable danger in the discussion, on a purely human level, of any period of power in the church's history. The Spirit of God works when and where he will; there is no compelling him nor holding him within a net of words. Yet in his wisdom he has given to men gifts over the use of which they have discretion and in the exercise of which they may sometimes do better and sometimes worse.

Reading of the great preachers of fifty years ago, one is impressed—or made envious, as the case may be—by the enthusiastic hearing accorded them from every level of society. Granted their strong sincerity, their literary skill, and their dramatic power, the *succès fou* of men like Parker and Spurgeon in London, Whyte in Edinburgh, Watson in Liverpool, and Jowett in New York, must have a value by way of precept or contrast for our own time when, it is said, the giants of the pulpit are no more. The usual explanations—they had neither movies nor radio to compete with; they lived in the lecture age; they were unmenaced by the automobile—are here passed over. The fact remains that for their day they were far more effective in reaching quantities of souls than we are.

One submits that it was not, as is often suggested, because their day was easier or mankind more anxious for the gospel, but rather because they had better adapted themselves to their situation and saw the need of their people clearly and whole. Ironically enough, our own failure to follow their example has arisen out of our veneration of their practice. Without regard to the background against which they preached, we have attempted to address a very different background in their language. And rightly admiring the relevance of what they said for when they said it, we very wrongly proceed to equip our modern preachers with inept anachronism.

The purpose of this paper, then, is to suggest the vital difference between past and present propagation of the gospel, to indicate certain dangers peculiarly contemporary, to propose one or two corrective exer-

cises, and to examine very briefly the connection between altered preaching and unalterable worship.

I

The more one examines the content of late nineteenth-century sermons, the more one is impressed with the difficulty at which they chiefly aimed: it was the hardship commonly experienced in adapting an unfamiliar and unassimilated world to a familiar and accepted religion. For in the years succeeding 1840 there had come about for English-speaking people a reversal in the focus of wonder. With steam and electricity, laboratories and locofocos, nature had grown more strange than supernature. Mechanical advance thrust names and news and notions hitherto unheard into disturbing prominence. The minister's job, obviously, was to interpret these unknowns from without in terms of a familiar religious vocabulary.

Emphasis on the familiarity, for their time, of that vocabulary can hardly be exaggerated. Indeed, our whole problem is to a large extent semantic. For the Britain and America of Victoria's day were steeped in the echoes of three documents—the King James Bible, the Book of Common Prayer, the productions catechetical and confessional of the Westminster divines. If you add certain other perennials—Foxe, Baxter, Bunyan, Taylor, Watts, Butler, Matthew Henry—you merely strengthen your impression of their diet. The readers of these books were not necessarily more religious than any other generation; but they knew the *words* of religion, and the words had life and meaning. Justification had its place, decently set apart from sanctification; it was a moot question whether a man might “read his title clear to mansions in the skies”; the doctrines of creation, providence, and grace were first premises; however you explained it, election was more comprehensible than electricity.

Which meant, for the preacher, that electricity must be explained in terms of election. Sermons of adjustment must be preached, sermons of reassurance. It was all in God's plan—the railroad, the telegraph, the noise, the speed; as for God's plan itself, there was no need to argue that: that was something you knew about, something you took as much for granted as God himself. The minister's job was to show that the new “natural law” had roots and rights in the older “spiritual world.” And while Drummond himself was keenly aware of the tension involved in such a demonstration, he too remained absorbed in relating the new to the old—which was precisely the proper thing for him, or anybody

else, to be absorbed in, so long as the old remained the more familiar aspect of experience.

For it was what his readers and his hearers needed—just as the somewhat cloistered Edinburgh students who flocked on Sunday evenings in the nineties to Free St. George's needed to hear from Alexander Whyte that the Christianity of the *Divina Commedia* was a part of their own heritage, and that John Knox's God could encompass even Renaissance literature. By the same token Parker's oratory and later Gore's analysis were addressed to presupposed inclinations—though Gore was a greater theologian than he was a preacher. You do not suggest a "Reconstruction of Belief" save to those who are sure that belief of some kind is essential. It was the school of *Ecce Homo*, then, that was on the defensive: Matthew Arnold must needs evangelize. For the preacher's part, the times called for confirmation rather than conviction. Whyte and Drummond and the rest met their situation accordingly, and thousands flocked to the meeting.

That they are not flocking now, in anything like the same numbers, is a reflection, not on the power of the gospel, but on the ability of its exponents to adjust themselves and their preaching to a new situation. If, in matters supernatural, medieval naïveté gave place to Victorian complacency, Victorian complacency has given place in turn to modern ignorance. The old vocabulary has gone, together with the knowledge of it; supersonic speed is for most a more intelligible concept than salvation. It is the preacher's job no longer to adapt new facts to recognized religion, but to assert the timeless relevancy of religion to the world of contemporary life.

Effectively to make that assertion is, as I say, a problem in semantics. Upon all who wish to propagate the gospel—and doubly upon every preacher and student for the ministry—there lies the obligation to achieve lucidity—not simply to be at home in the speech-patterns of one's ancestors, but skillful in interpreting those patterns into twentieth-century language. To retain for its own sake what was once intelligible is either forensic sentimentalism or intellectual laziness. It is also a betrayal of the preacher's trust. Yet from how many pulpits do we not hear exhortation upon exhortation shrouded in terminology which simply has no meaning for the average listener? "Avail yourself of the grace of God," cries Dr. A. (All right, doctor; how? and what is it? and is there such a thing?) "Look not to money nor to power for the world's salvation," counsels Dr. B., "look to God!" (Very well, doctor; how?

where is he? what is this "salvation"?) "The final fact for Christendom," thunders Bishop C., "is the Incarnation of the Word!" (Oh, bishop, what in Christendom *is* the Word? the Incarnation? What in Christendom is Christendom?) Yet Drs. A. and B. and Bishop C., good men all, are mystified by the failure of these sermons to grip and enlarge their flocks. Personally convinced and professionally confident, they are blind to the pathetic bewilderment of hungry men and women who, seeking the Bread of Life, receive a stone of stumbling.

II

It must be said for the parsons above mentioned that they stick pretty close to Christianity. Though they preach as if in Russian to an English-speaking audience, theirs is a Russian orthodoxy. Whereas there are others, more acute and often less profound, who sense the barrier of altered meaning, and try by various ways to circumvent it. Against certain of these circumventions a word of warning must be given.

There is, for example, the school of thought which abandons religion altogether and simply advocates ethics. Notwithstanding the "melancholy, dull, withdrawing roar" characteristic of recent liberalism, there are still a good few preachers for whom behavior is more important than belief. "By their works ye shall know them," for "what doth the Lord require of thee," they ask, but a decent record and a helping hand? In this regard the religious societies traditionally opposed to dogma have set a splendid pattern of accomplishment, and the effectiveness of Unitarian and Quaker philanthropy is embarrassingly obvious to Christians of more catholic affiliation. Besides, activism has always had a special attraction for Americans, who like to think even of their devotions in terms of efficiency. The fact remains, however, that mere moral exhortation will not rescue the alcoholic; it is sadly true that greed persists despite the most unselfish of examples. Spiritual pride battens on ethical perfection; and surely there is something peculiarly inappropriate in proposing an ethical cure for an age whose major problem even secular authority has pronounced to be theological.

Another popular way out is to make a work out of faith, and of religion a means rather than an end. "Have faith!" Why then? Because faith will cure your insomnia, raise your wages, help you to win the boss's confidence, endow you with popularity, make you a better talker, fix up your nerves, banish your complexes. True, many things are to be "added unto" those who seek God's Kingdom, but not, I think, to

those who seek it with the "things" as motive. Yet if you look through a metropolitan paper any Saturday and pick out the sermon topics advertising every sort of panacea, you may well be convinced that Christianity originated with Mary Pickford's suggestion, "Why not try God?" Observe too the neurotic popularity of sects which offer a northwest passage to inward peace and outward prosperity. Remark the odd concubinage of Protestantism and psychoanalysis—the gains in stature of the latter at the former's expense. And contemplate the newest humiliation of our Lord, as he is used—and found useful—as a tool in therapy. "Perfect love casteth out fear"—the text was cited lately in the writer's hearing by a minister who went on to say: "So it does. We have the word of the apostle for it. It is the message of the Master. *More than that*, it is the considered verdict of modern science!" (The italics are mine.) But think of their implication: beyond the fumbling concepts of Christ and his friends, we have finally achieved a scientific witness to the truth: we have testimony now that we can trust! Surely a strange position of dependency is here reached when religion is reduced from an objective to a channel, and an ancillary channel at that. We shall hardly succeed in convincing men and women that our faith is relevant to every area of life if our sole proof is its sufferance at the hands of a half-grown science.

There are those, however, among the circumventers of the barrier who make no such attempt, but are content to buttress the old language of redemption with so vast a show of what is known as "fellowship" that the puzzled public will forget its problems in emotional response. The more staid churches tend to attribute all such policy to vagrant sects of indeterminate denomination. The fact is that every Protestant communion is in some degree infected, evincing one or another sign of a determination on no account to apply dogma to life. To avoid such application a number of devices are employed—innocently, one supposes, but with stultifying effectiveness. In place of true exposition, the Bible is constantly quoted by chapter and verse, the numerical reference serving as a kind of homiletic bludgeon. The very phrases most in need of interpretation are employed like spells, reiterated till they induce hypnosis.¹ Pious jargon and scriptural citation are interspersed with paragraphs of back-country jocularity whose butt, more than likely, is the Christian scholar or earnest doubter — anyone, in fact, whose lack of

¹Sad to say, the name of Jesus is among the words most often so repeated. It is pronounced—over and over again—with a vocalization of both eses.

homespun can be diagnosed as covert skepticism. Moral denunciation is addressed to the sins of the flesh; social issues, save for temperance and Sabbath-keeping, are wholly eschewed. Emphasis on experience reduces the sermon itself to an incident within a ritual of frenetic juvenalia; no attempt is made to translate terms; the "blood" is preached with a gusto well-nigh perverse; to try to understand "the old-time religion" is somehow to malign it. . . . But on anyone with a radio further description is wasted.

To how large an extent the contemporary pulpit is given over to these circumventions, it may be left for the reader to decide. Nor would it be fair to insist on any single motive for the refusal of our preachers to come to grips with the religious illiteracy of our generation. Each of the substitutes above described is susceptible, of course, of becoming a genuine enthusiasm; each becomes for its proponent the genuine gospel. Yet one wonders whether a deal of such matter has not been born of forgetfulness—forgetfulness that the object of preaching is not to fill seats in church but thrones in heaven.

III

In drawing together a few positive suggestions by way of remedy, it should be borne in mind that this paper advocates neither a diminution of theological emphasis nor an abandonment of classical Christian terminology. On the contrary, it is in order to increase theological emphasis, to make of theology the potent public influence it once was and ought once more to be, that an interpretation—not an abandonment—of vocabulary is recommended. There is high beauty and appropriate splendor in the old words, to forsake which would be needlessly to impoverish religion. No one has yet proposed that literary classics be utterly banished from education. Yet educational authority in the secular sphere has gone so desperately far in this direction that it behooves the church more than ever to guard its ancient treasures, remembering meanwhile that like the classics of every other field, they have an esoteric status for our generation. And it is to bring the esoteric out of hiding, to dispel the mists of professional sacerdotalism, that reform is urged.

The teacher of homiletics will be concerned with this matter—particularly in two ways. It will be his business, first, to make sure that the seminarian himself understands what he means when he talks about abstractions like the grace of God, and second, that he can make others understand his understanding. If it be held that the first objective tres-

passes on the department of systematics, the best answer is to admit that systematics and homiletics have been too long and too far separated. And while it is beyond the function of the homilete to instruct in dogma, it is decidedly his duty to make sure that dogma has personal meaning for the individual student, and meaning susceptible of articulation. Techniques for explanation will be required, two or three of which are suggested here.

It will prove of immediate value to anyone engaged in the spoken or written propagation of Christianity to cultivate that perspicuity of style and simplicity of language which have characterized of recent years a limited number of British writers and an even smaller group of Americans. Whether or not our educational deficiencies are to blame, the average American sermon or religious essay is marked by inanities, professionalisms, cant terms, promotional jargon, turgid psychologisms. Our light touch is heavy, our *mot juste* rare; it has apparently occurred to very few of us that to "talk like a minister" is the minister's ultimate tragedy. One excepts of course the sermons and writings of such men as Dr. Paul Scherer, Canon Bell, and Professor Trueblood. One welcomes such books as Professor Walsh's recent *Stop Looking and Listen*. If Reinhold Niebuhr's masterly analyses remain caviare to the general, these others are providing the necessary vitamins in vulgate. Nevertheless one observes with something like envy the debt they owe, whether tacit or expressed, to such British pens as those of Mr. C. S. Lewis, the late Archbishop Temple, Principal Micklem, Dr. John Whale, and others.

In part, this old-country effectiveness may be traced to the influence of that remarkable journal, the *British Weekly* (though the *British Weekly* at its best was aimed at readers of high religious literacy). In part—even beyond Mr. Lewis' acknowledgment—there may have been a lasting mysticism in the Kailyard school. In part, of course, the classic disciplines that made an orator of Mr. Churchill have made British apologists exceptionally comprehensible, users of the right word at the right time, experts in common simile and vivid illustration. The disillusioning heritage of war, from Studdert-Kennedy's time onward, has helped them to be abstainers from unnecessary adjectives, despisers of jargon, realists in analysis, pessimists of time but optimists of eternity. And a study of their work—Lewis, Temple, McCulloch, Micklems both, Whale, Winkworth, the contributors to *Asking Them Questions*—the list is potentially much longer—will greatly reward the contemporary American preacher. The joy of reading them he has discovered for

himself; the higher joy of reproducing their effectiveness remains for him to achieve.

A second suggestion regards economy of reference. Much of the woolliness of current evangelism results from the preacher's failure to preach about one thing at a time. If, in addition to plural concern, he suffers from comparative uncertainty in each division, the result is miserably predictable. A typical performance comes to mind from recent hearing. The young preacher announces that he will speak on Prayer. It is far too large a subject for a single sermon, but it isn't big enough for him. A third of the way through he attempts—with considerable temerity—an explanation of our Lord's prayer in the garden. "Not my will" suggests obedience, humility. Obedience is then illustrated from family experience—not as a requisite to prayer, but as a virtue by the way. Humility is adduced—somewhat improbably—from the life of Paul. Paul suggests Christian heroism and the great pilgrimage. However, Paul was persecuted, whereas the enlightenment of our time demands tolerance. A word or so on racial justice, a prediction of better days to come, a hurried recollection that prayer is a Good Thing—and we are done—twenty-five minutes filled once more!

Were the foregoing caricature as unfair as it sounds, or its original a rare occasion, one had less need for insistence on homiletical economy. Unfortunately the need is accented weekly from hundreds of pulpits, and it behooves one accordingly to submit certain thoughts found helpful to self-restriction. The first of these is to elicit from a text—even if it contains more—a single main idea or proposition to be defended and advanced. (This suggestion in no way precludes the tripartite division of established textual preaching—provided all three parts are "facets"—as Dr. Luccock says—of a single jewel.) This proposition should be written out in affirmative sentence form and—even more important—kept constantly in mind during all stages of the sermon's writing. For there is healthy discipline in turning from a purple passage just completed to one's original idea—though to do so bring mortification of afflatus, as well as of flesh. Additional restriction will be gained from the isolation of those individuals, teachings, or convictions which stand in opposition to the proposition—fewer windmills will be tilted at, more demons slain. And perhaps most important of all, is the avoidance, in the written proposition, of language which requires further explanation; for when such terms are present, the proposition fails wholly of its purpose; it is not, so to speak, far enough back; it demands additional ex-

egesis. Let one suppose, for example, that a young preacher decides to preach on salvation through Christ. He puts down his proposition: "This sermon is to show that Christ died for the sins of mankind." Notice how his statement, admirably acceptable to the religious literate, leaves the religious illiterate still to grope for further explication. What does "for" mean? What *are* the "sins of mankind"? *How* does Christ's death—a matter of past occurrence—bear upon them now? And so on. The implied concern with something long ago, and the abstract allusion to "mankind" both suggest unreality and irrelevance, the very characteristics the preacher is most anxious to avoid. Will he not do better to translate his theme into some such words as these? "This sermon is to show that in Christ's death God makes available to all of us a new relationship with himself under which the evil we have done no longer constitutes an obstacle to the good we may do." Granted this is longer, less compact, less "aesthetic"—but we are not preaching to connoisseurs; we are preaching to children.

And it is in the language of babes and sucklings that the contemporary preacher will find his greatest power. It is as he seeks to speak God's truth in the language of babes and sucklings that he will find himself most honestly examining his own belief, most shrewdly critical of his favorite platitudes, most critically impatient of his past work. It is not an easy business, this discipline in definition, nor is it in any way to be confused with preaching down to one's people; on the contrary it is the beginning of preaching on their level; it is the exercise of the prophetic munus after Ezekiel's fashion who "sat where they sat."

IV

Much of the foregoing section has been necessarily of technical and therefore restricted interest. The major issue of interpretation is, however, the concern of parson and layman alike. Before this paper is brought to a close, a brief word should be said of the relationship—in this regard—between preaching and worship. Some such comment seems particularly desirable in view of the well-earned acclaim with which the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament has been recently greeted. Few would deny the superior accuracy of this new translation, but its use in public worship is still for many a matter of grave question. While it is not our purpose here to discuss the particular pros and cons of the Scripture issue, the contagious nature of the resulting enthusiasm for modern speech demands cautious consideration. For we are

urged by some who have adopted the Revised Standard Version—in the face of its own example—to abandon the use of the second person singular in prayer. It may be that the suggestion has not yet received widespread attention; nevertheless it is increasingly voiced, especially in those churches whose deep reformation piety eschews the shackles of prescribed ritual. Let's be realistic, cry the advocates of this modernism. Here's a way to do the very thing you're talking about and rid the church of a reputation for verbal antiquarianism. Nobody says "thou" anymore . . . why talk to God in seventeenth-century English? On the face of it, there is strength and reason in this plea, and it does not directly appear why an appeal for contemporary relevance in preaching should not include a similar demand for contemporary speech in worship.

That it need not, and indeed ought not, is the writer's convinced opinion. Against liturgical change the argument from familiarity, imperative homiletically, weighs heavily. The different purposes of preaching and worship, the individual character of the one and the corporate character of the other, the relative dominance in the two of intellect and emotion, the importance to each of the perspicuous and the aesthetic—all these are reasons against an omnibus reform. Admittedly, there is something unacceptable to the majority of Protestants in the unintelligibility cult of certain ultramontane liturgists—the claim that worship is to be shared by *totum-simul* impression rather than by cognition of its elements; nevertheless there is more danger by far in most churches of reformed tradition that the atmosphere of heavenly things will so stoop to an earthly level as to lose identity, with prayer and praise and music familiar not so much for their sublimity as for their secular suggestion. And if sermons are to shun the dull vacuity and pompous shoptalk of political demagoguery and hypnotism, there is all the more reason, surely, for liturgics to avoid all reminiscence of the tabloid and the juke box.

As a matter of fact the language of classic liturgy is not obscure, but actually childlike. "Glory be to the Father," sings the church, "and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost. As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end"—with directness and repetition that is at once childlike and epic. There is nothing here—any more than there is in the Lord's Prayer, or the Apostles' Creed, or the *Gloria in Excelsis*—of speculative theology. The praise of the fathers is as uncomplicated as that of the psalmist; the prayers for "the whole state of Christ's Church," for "all sorts and conditions of men," for those "afflicted in mind, body, or estate" do not require further explanation.

Their simplicity speaks to the heart; and because it is a simplicity well-nigh lost yet eternally comprehensible, it lifts the worshiper at once into the rarified atmosphere of heaven while insisting that he may breathe that atmosphere on earth. The association produced by its grandeur is one of uncontaminated spirituality; the connotation of its lucidity is that of a "light shining *in darkness*."

Perhaps the final issue out of our semantic affliction will be reached as we replace the troubled speech of human commentary with the ageless serenities of God's revelation. There was a time in Scotland when *Sursum corda* was held to be the highest evangelism. And when modern preaching more nearly approximates the word of Scripture and modern exhortation the perspicuity of classic liturgy, we shall the sooner hear in our day and generation, as we bid men to lift up their hearts, the strong response on every hand: "We lift them up unto the Lord."

Christianity in a Concentration Camp

OTTO STARGARDT

"And the light shineth in darkness" (John 1:5).

SO MUCH HAS been written on concentration camps with all their atrocities and cruelties, their hunger, cold, and death, that nobody wants to hear more of those horrible places where thousands and millions have suffered and been driven to despair. I do not intend to speak of these only too well-known cruelties. What I have to tell is quite different. I would show how amid deepest depression, danger, and persecution a light began to shine—flickering and small at the beginning but growing stronger, till it became a luminous star in the darkness of night. And this light did not fail!

There were two men in our camp who had not known each other before, who met one day and spoke of God and Christianity—conceptions and ideas strictly ignored and forbidden by the Nazis. Both men had been judges in Germany: the one, Dr. Goldschmidt of Hamburg, the other myself, coming from Berlin.

In the middle of the small town, now turned into a concentration camp, there was a church, an ancient Roman Catholic Church, locked fast and looking down in a melancholy manner on the passers-by who crossed the dirty street, hurrying to their daily work of slaves. Nobody was ever allowed to enter that church, nor was there any service or sermon, since Sunday was a working day just like the rest of the week.

"Listen," said Dr. Goldschmidt, "should we not try to hold services to worship our Saviour and to find some consolation for us and our fellow sufferers in hearing the Word of God? Would you help me in this work?"

"I will," I replied, without hesitation. "We must look for some quiet place, where we will not be disturbed by noisy and busy people. It is quite impossible to arrange such a thing as we are planning in one of our own rooms, crowded with people lying or sitting about on the ground. But never mind, let us go ahead and find a room."

The first Christians worshiped and praised Jesus in the catacombs. We too found such a subterranean refuge in a cellar, under an old barrack, for some months. But mostly our services were held in a draughty attic, where we could get in only by climbing up fragile, broken stair-

cases without banisters. It was a dreary, dull place! There were only six persons at that first service, which made me think of the Word of Christ: "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." It seemed a dangerous enterprise in the beginning; we believed we might get into trouble, if the S.S. guards found us or became suspicious. However, the next Sunday a dozen inmates of the camp came. They listened with emotion to the Word of the gospel and spoke their confession of faith and the Lord's Prayer.

From then on, the number of the community was increasing constantly and the good news of this unique hour of worship spread from mouth to mouth. As time went on we even dared to sing hymns. No hymnbooks being available, we just sang the old hymns, well known since our childhood. They sounded so strange in these odd surroundings. Even a violin was found and a kind old artist agreed to play for us. Thus the service became more dignified and solemn. Gradually I began to create a little choir and to practice with a few singers just before the service began. It was a great moment when after some months a harmonium was brought to the attic. It was an old instrument, out of tune, but nevertheless it seemed to us more beautiful than the most famous organ. Fortunately I had a Bible, so that I could read the pericopes of the Sunday. Theological books there were, at first, none whatever; all that we could say and preach came from the memory and from the heart. But the audience listened with profound devotion and gratitude.

As Good Friday approached, we thought we could not more reverently celebrate this high holy day than by observing the Lord's Supper. But how? Thinking of wine seemed a paradox in a concentration camp. And bread? Bread was one of the most precious and rare things. The small piece which every prisoner received and which was supposed to last for three days was generally eaten up by most people on the first day, half starving as they were. So it was impossible that the members of our community should save bread for the Holy Supper. We took courage and decided to take the legal way of asking the authorities for these indispensable ingredients. They were surprised, seemed unwilling and reluctant. Nobody wanted to take such a responsibility. So we were sent from one place to another, from one commissariat to another. Finally we were sent to the "Central Bakery." There we succeeded in persuading them and proudly obtained some white bread, which we had not seen for many months, and which we cut into small pieces. Instead of wine we got tea, not real tea naturally, but anyway tea it was called,

and sweetened with saccharine. Glasses did not exist, but there were some goblets, mostly the upper parts of broken thermos flasks.

It was a supreme moment when with the sacramental words the Holy Supper was administered for the first time and everybody felt its blessing. More than a hundred people wanted the communion to be given them. We let eight people step forward at one time, and Dr. Goldschmidt and I offered them the bread and the wine (*Ersatz*) with the words of institution. Each group was given an appropriate blessing with some verses from the Bible; for instance, one of the Beatitudes or one of St. Paul's words from his Epistles to the Romans or the Corinthians. Soft music accompanied the celebration. For me and the other man it was an overwhelming experience to stand there not only as a passive member, but acting as minister in Christ's name. At the end of the celebration I gave my fellow lay minister the communion and he gave it to me. We were assisted by two true members of the community, the well-known Viennese orthopedist, Professor Saxl, on whom I could also rely as a pillar of the choir, and by the young Eric Wachs, of whose sad fate I have to tell later on.

Thereafter it was possible to celebrate the communion on several other occasions, such as Christmas Eve and the day in memory of Martin Luther's Reformation. It was a strange audience that came to our services: many old and semi-invalid people, veterans from the first World War, blind and lame, along with young people, many in ragged clothes which were the only ones they possessed. But the radiant expression of their faces when hearing the Word of Christ, "Blessed are they that mourn, for they shall be comforted," is unforgettable to me; their tears of joy, their glimpse of hope. The most impressive communion was given when two of our most faithful members had received orders to leave the camp, which meant that they would be sent to the gas chambers or killed in some other way. They both—Eric Wachs, of whom I have spoken, and Mrs. Taibrich—asked for the Holy Supper, as their transportation was to take place the evening of that Sunday. So the Supper was given them both, and the congregation rose to their feet in honor of the innocent condemned to death. Everyone knew it was a final farewell. And indeed it was; we never again heard from them.

As time went on there were more than 500 persons who wished to hear the Scripture and who attended our services. Many had questions to ask after the service or wanted help or advice, and I was glad to help them as well as possible. In the last months of our imprisonment

there came a young Dutch theologian, Max Enker, with some hundreds of his Evangelical countrymen. Naturally we asked him to hold services sometimes, which he did in the German language; in Dutch it was not allowed.

There were also many children in the camp. They were strictly forbidden to learn anything or to receive instruction of any kind. This was extremely worrying to their parents. I therefore offered to give the children lessons, secretly teaching them religion. This had to be done sometimes in the corner of a room in an old and dirty barrack, sometimes in my own room—for finally my wife and I got a room for ourselves, a very poor one indeed, really miserable, but at least it guaranteed a little privacy. There I taught the children God's and Christ's holy words, relating first from the Old Testament the stories of the Creation, the Patriarchs, Moses, Sinai and the Ten Commandments, King David and the Psalms, the prophets, and the destruction of Jerusalem; then from the New Testament I told them of our Saviour and the Apostles. I was glad to see that the enthusiasm of all my pupils was great. At the first lesson there were five children, thereafter nine or more. They were of different ages and came from families different in religion and background. But all loved to attend these sessions and even the most terrible cold or mud could not prevent them from coming. All were very attentive and showed a most vivid interest.

Often I was interrupted by their questions, which sometimes were unusual. A girl of thirteen years, Anita Heumann, the eldest, a very bright and delicate creature, asked me once why God, merciful as he is, permits evil. How could he allow her and her parents and the other prisoners to be brought to this horrible camp where they had to suffer all kinds of cruelties and so much hunger? Why, asked little Ursula Wilzig, did God permit some inmates to be shot while trying to escape, and why did we all have to be punished for their disobedience? Another wanted an exact description of how God looked and how men could be sure of his existence if they had never seen him. When I told of the sixth commandment, "Thou shalt not kill," one of the children in full earnest asked, "Is it then not allowed to kill a bedbug?" They knew only too well how everybody had to fight against the plague of vermin which among numerous other torments could drive people nearly to insanity. I gave answers according to my best judgment.

Not only did the children need instruction and stimulation, but also the grown-ups wanted more than the Sunday services. I therefore started

"community evenings," following the example of Dr. Niemöller, my pastor in dear old Dahlem, my former parish. With these evenings, open to every member of the community, I wanted to serve three purposes. First, that all members of our evangelical community, gathered together from all the lands of Europe, should come to know each other better, learn something of each other's background, past, and religious needs. Many members therefore told about themselves. In several lectures I spoke of my activities as a judge, as a member of the synods, of my former residence in Mittenwalde, the town of Paulus Gerhardt. Other lectures followed. A blind poetess told of Franz Liszt, the famous composer, who as a near friend of her father came often to visit the family. Doctors and physicians spoke of their former work, which they had been obliged to leave and exchange for less scientific jobs in the camp, such as carrying rubbish, garbage, and burdens of all sorts. One doctor chose as his theme, "Faith and science"; another spoke on "Religion and medicine." "Love and justice in the education of youth" was the title of still another lecture by a former teacher. A high-ranking officer spoke on "Religious experiences in the first World War," and on another occasion, "The Popes of the last century."

This slender, good-looking man, Fieldmarshal Lieutenant Friedländer of the old Austrian Army, a vivacious and gay person, a most brilliant speaker, a man of high culture and deep knowledge, had promised me to speak once more at one of our community evenings. I had announced his lecture for October 11, 1944, when suddenly, the day before, the news spread that he was ordered to leave the camp and be transported to another camp—the usual announcement of being sent to the gas chamber or shot. I was terribly upset. If this rumor was true, one of the outstanding personalities of the camp would be killed; and incidentally, the lecture in my community evening would have to be canceled. I left my room the morning of October 11 as usual for my office at the post, feeling very depressed and uncertain. A short time later my wife, who was a nurse in the camp, hurried to the post office, to tell me that the Fieldmarshal Lieutenant had come to see me just after I had left. He had said that indeed he had to leave the same evening; "but I wanted your husband to know that before going I'll keep my promise and hold the lecture. The only thing I ask is that no allusion be made to my leaving, no announcement of any kind besides the usual one. I simply speak and go."

The evening came, the community assembled in an old subterranean

stable of a barrack. The Fieldmarshal Lieutenant had not come when I started the worship. But a few minutes later I saw him show up. After the devotions were finished, and my introductory words, our guest speaker began his lecture. He spoke from memory more than an hour and a half, without the slightest sign of emotion or excitement. It was a wonderful lecture he gave, which he called "*Was ich im Krieg erlebte.*" Nobody who was uninformed of his tragic fate could have a presentiment of what he was threatened with in the next few hours. Respecting his wish we stood silent, and after some words of thanks which I spoke in the name of the community he left the room, straight and dignified—a true hero covered with a far higher than military glory, an example of how faith and spirit conquer violence. Nobody ever heard from him again.

I spoke of three purposes which I had for the community evenings. The second reason why I wanted these meetings was that people, generally so depressed and hopeless, might find in addition to the Sunday services an hour's relaxation in the middle of the week after the daily hard work. These evenings were on Wednesdays. The lectures given on all sorts of subjects, about religion, art, music, politics, science, mostly by experienced experts, proved to be a real refreshment for all who participated.

But there was a third reason, too. A community was achieved thereby not only for the Protestants in the camp, but for God-fearing people of all religions and nations—for Catholics as well as Jews, for Germans, Austrians, Danish, Dutch, and so on. Several times prominent Roman Catholics in the camp were guest speakers in these evangelical community evenings, and sometimes there were Jewish speakers also. Once a famous rabbi, formerly of Berlin, Dr. Leo Baeck, spoke on the theme, "Work and spirit," and the entire audience applauded wholeheartedly.

This practical Christianity which embraced all people and all races with universal love, the mutual esteem for other religions, took root in the hearts of many of my fellow prisoners. This was proved to me by numerous letters which I have received and still am receiving from all parts of the world, where now they are living in freedom. They not only tell what these hours of worship and fellowship meant to them, regardless of their creed, but they also say that they want to live according to these principles of true Christianity. They are full of gratitude for the consolation they found in God amid deep distress.

The seed of the words of Holy Scripture have fallen in good and fruitful earth, have given a rich harvest. A woman who had five years

of education in a Roman Catholic convent tells of her gratitude for those meetings, especially as the sermons were also addressed to Catholics. She writes: "I want to lead a true Christian life from now on. I will endeavor to follow the words of the gospel which you taught us so fervently." A young girl of seventeen who had formerly lived without religion but in camp attended our services and asked to be baptized (which was not possible there), writes me from Hanover: "My religious instruction was a wonderful experience." An elderly man who was stricken with sickness many months, suffering from cold and hunger, now writes from Berlin: "My faith is God and Jesus and through him I am perfectly happy. He is my wealth, is all I want. I still have the tiny slip of paper you gave me for Easter, 1944, on which are written the words, 'I know that my Redeemer lives,' and I treasure this paper." Another writes from Gotha, Germany: "Your proclamation of the gospel spoken in these poor and strange surroundings were the best, the only support against all distress and dangers, and even now help me not to despair."

This makes me think: why cannot this perfect understanding reign between all men? Why can they not live together in brotherly fashion, not only within the narrow walls of a concentration camp, under severe compulsions and restraints, but everywhere? If the world would follow the example of these poor, persecuted people, their sufferings might not be fruitless. Then the word of Christ would be fulfilled: "A new command I give unto you, that you love one another, as I have loved you, that ye also love one another. By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if you love one another."

Preparation for Amsterdam

JOHN C. BENNETT*

The coming World Council Assembly will benefit by decades of ecumenical "co-operative thinking"—comprehensive studies by Christian leaders the world around are nearing completion.

THE FIRST ASSEMBLY of the World Council of Churches to be held at Amsterdam this summer has two purposes. It will, on the one hand, be a constitutional convention and business meeting that will formally inaugurate the World Council as an institution and lay down the main lines of policy for the future. It will, on the other hand, be a great study conference similar in many respects to the ecumenical conferences that have preceded it. As a study conference it will have as its subject the theme *Man's Disorder and God's Design*. It is expected that about half of the time of the Assembly will be devoted to the discussion of that subject. For that purpose the Assembly will be divided into four sections and several plenary sessions will be devoted to the reports of those sections in order to give expression to the mind of the Assembly as a whole on each of the major issues discussed. Also, for that purpose there has been a very elaborate process of preparation that will be described in this article. Before turning to a general consideration of that preparation there should be some explanation of the wording of the theme.

It is not difficult to guess the meaning of the first part of the theme, "Man's Disorder," but there has been some controversy about the words, "God's Design." I was present at the meeting when those words were chosen and can explain the reasons for choosing them. An earlier phrasing of the theme had used the words, "The Order of God and the Present Disorder of Man." There were those who thought that "Order" had too static a connotation and that a more dynamic word should be sought. There was no obvious word on which there was easy agreement, but it was finally decided to use "design" and then to explain the intention in using it in the literature prepared for the Assembly. "Design" is used with two references in mind. It refers to the ultimate purpose of God. But it also refers to the pattern of what God has already done in creation and redemption. So, "design" is used as the broadest and least misleading word for the whole

* Dr. Bennett was a member of the Study Department in Geneva, Switzerland, for six months, and edited a booklet on *Man's Disorder and God's Design*.

plan and activity of God in relation to human life, in relation to man's disorder.

The content of the subject that was chosen for the Assembly can be seen from the way in which it was divided into four subtopics, each of which will seem to the reader to be large enough for a series of conferences. These four subdivisions of the subject that will constitute the themes of the four sections of the Assembly are as follows:

- The Universal Church in God's Design.
- God's Design and Man's Witness.
- The Church and the Disorder of Society.
- The Church and International Affairs.

Let me try to put each of these more clearly. The first section will deal with the doctrine of the Church with particular emphasis upon the relation between the divine and human aspects of the Church. There will be discussion concerning the way in which each of these aspects is related to the unity and divisions of the Church. Some of the interests of the Faith and Order movement will come to expression in connection with the discussion of this section. The second section will deal with evangelism, both in the context of foreign missions and in the context of western societies with a Christian background. The third section will deal with major economic and political problems concerning which Christians seek guidance from the Church. The theme of the fourth section explains itself.

The preparation for the work of these sections has been put in the hands of four commissions, a part of the membership of which has been at work for more than a year. Each commission will have thirty members and it is expected that about half of them will be official delegates to the Assembly. The other half will be made up of persons already chosen for the contribution that they can make to the subjects. These experts will have the right to speak in the sectional meetings at Amsterdam but they will not have the right to vote. This is not to suggest that none of the regular delegates will be experts on any of these subjects, but obviously the denominations, when they can appoint so few delegates, will not choose them with particular subjects in mind. This commission device has been chosen as a way of insuring the presence at Amsterdam of voices that might be passed over by the official leadership of the denominations —some prophets (we hope), some theologians, some laymen who are involved directly in the problems to be discussed.

The leadership of these commissions is as follows:

Commission I. Chairman: Bishop Gustaf Aulén (Sweden).
Secretary: The Rev. Oliver Tomkins (England).

Commission II. Chairman: Professor Hendrick Kraemer (Holland).
Secretary: Bishop Stephen Neill (England).

Commission III. Chairman: Professor Reinhold Niebuhr (U. S. A.).
Secretary: The Rev. Nils Ehrenström (The Geneva secretariat of the World Council).

Commission IV. Chairman: Mr. Kenneth Grubb (England).
Secretary: Professor O. Frederick Nolde (U.S.A.).

This whole process is under the direction of the Study Department Commission of the World Council of Churches which has its headquarters in Geneva. President Henry P. Van Dusen is Chairman of this commission and its Director is the Rev. Nils Ehrenström, who has been close to the center of the ecumenical movement for more than a decade. What is called "study," but would perhaps be called more accurately "co-operative thinking" has been one of the continuing elements in the ecumenical movement from the time of the Stockholm Conference in 1925, and this method of preparing for conferences goes back to the Edinburgh Conference of 1912, the preparation for which was under the direction of Dr. J. H. Oldham. Dr. Oldham directed the preparation for the Oxford Conference and he now has a very important place in the work of the third commission in preparation for Amsterdam. These decades of ecumenical "study" or "co-operative thinking" have done more than can readily be imagined to break down the middle walls of partition between the thinkers of different communions and of different nations and continents. A large measure of the unity that already exists among the churches is the result of this quiet work that has been going on for many years.

The method that is being followed is quite simple. Four volumes are being written, with the authors chosen from many nations and churches, a volume on the subject of each of the four sections of the Assembly. The invitation to the authors of the various chapters (about forty in all) went out during the summer of 1946. Today first drafts of all but a few of the chapters are ready and in a good many cases second drafts. Each draft has been circulated all over the world to selected critics, and the criticisms have been circulated in the same way. There have been several meetings of members of the commissions, of regional groups, and of the Study Department Commission itself at which the material has been discussed intensively. In this country the chapters have gone to about

five hundred critics in all. There is an American Advisory Committee, with Professor Clarence T. Craig as Chairman and the Rev. Robert Bilheimer as the Executive Secretary. These volumes will not be ordinary symposia, but they will represent the result of a remarkable interchange of thought in the Church on a world scale. One significant result of this process has been the exchange of groups in Germany that have written or criticized papers with the Christian thinking in other countries.

It is very difficult to give any idea of the actual contents of the volumes themselves, but I shall try to lift out a few of the issues that have emerged and that are likely to be important for the discussion at Amsterdam.

1. The most important emphasis that has emerged in all of this material is the emphasis upon the renewal of the Church. That is the phrase most often used, but stronger words—such as “rebirth” or “reformation”—might express the thought more adequately. It is significant that in each of the first three volumes there is to be a chapter on the Church’s need of renewal. It is a fortunate circumstance that the same movement that is concerned about unity and co-operation is also concerned about rebirth. It is not enough to put many sick churches together. They must also be healed of their sickness. The outside critics of the Church would have difficulty in thinking up so many and such drastic things to say against it as we find in these chapters by loyal members of the Church. I am reminded of the title of a recent book by Dr. W. A. Visser ’t Hooft, the General Secretary of the World Council of Churches: *The Wretchedness and Greatness of the Church*. Those words, in that order, represent this characteristic emphasis upon the renewal of the Church. There is no stuffy ecclesiasticism here. There is a chapter by Karl Barth that goes the limit in its criticism of the actual churches and which will shock many an ecclesiastic when it is published. The Church as itself largely corrupted by the world that it is intended to redeem, the Church as the institution that has been so reactionary in its social connections in the past that it has alienated the democratic and radical movements of Europe and caused untold spiritual confusion, the Church as reflecting the social and racial divisions of the world in its own life, the Church as the greatest obstacle to evangelism—it is this Church, so much in need of rebirth, that is portrayed in these volumes. And yet even this Church is the earthen vessel that carries the greatest of all treasures, that witnesses to the Word of God by which it is ultimately judged, that is the link between ourselves and the saving acts of God in Christ, that is called to be

a manifestation—though it may never be more than a partial manifestation—of “God’s Design” in the world. Signs of the renewal of the Church in our time are recorded, but there is no exaggeration of their importance.

2. A second emphasis that recurs throughout the chapters for these preparatory volumes is the recognition of the depth of the present crisis of civilization. The American reader is likely to feel that this side of the matter is overstressed and that the residue of health that there may be in civilization has been overlooked. I doubt if it is possible to exaggerate the depth of the crisis, but that is not inconsistent with the acknowledgment that there are still resources even in the secular order for meeting it. It is natural that in this connection the various writers reflect the mood of the areas of the world in which they live. Dr. Oldham, in the basic chapter of diagnosis, finds the most important factor in the crisis to be the pressure of technology and applied science upon culture. But he is quite able to do justice to the constructive contribution of technology as well as to its destructive effects. On the other hand, a very able French Professor of Law, Jacques Ellul, provides an almost completely catastrophic interpretation of the present situation. Another variation is the tendency of some of the Asiatic contributions, especially those from India, to take a very hopeful view of communism and the Soviet Union.

3. A third emphasis is on the central place of evangelism in the work of the Church and upon the need of complete rethinking of the methods of evangelism. Here the problem is seen as a world problem but the secularization of the west is given as much attention as the needs of the lands associated with foreign missions. The second volume does an excellent job of analysis of the different kinds of people who need to be reached in east and west. It seeks to present the gospel in its relevance to the needs of modern men. Here it will be necessary to have two quite different statements of the gospel in this connection, and it remains to be seen what the relation between them will be. The most distinctive feature of this discussion of evangelism is the attempt to see what would be involved in a break-through by the Church into one or more of the sectors of contemporary society where at present the Christian message is ignored as a relic of another day, as a refuted superstition that is an obstacle to progress. The lines are drawn more sharply in some European countries than in America, and the awareness of the Church’s failure to reach the people is more acute there than here. So far, it cannot be said that new methods have been discovered or that many significant new examples of

evangelistic effort have been reported, but this radical re-orientation of the life and work of the Church as a whole, in terms of its evangelistic responsibility, is most important. The time has passed for the relegation of evangelism to certain specialists. It is a central function of the whole Church.

4. A fourth element in these materials that has impressed me is the aggressiveness of Christians in Asia. The younger leaders of the younger churches are talking back to the western church in no uncertain terms. Some of the most provocative papers, including criticisms of chapters, have come from India. There is great emphasis upon the race problem and upon the failures of the churches of the west in dealing with this problem. I think that the pressure of the younger churches of Asia upon our own American churches may be the one thing that will shame us into a more radical approach to the race issue here. It may force us to turn our many excellent words into actions. Another feature of this criticism of the west from Asiatic Christians is the openness that is shown toward communism. Communism and the Soviet Union are judged almost entirely by their relation to the race problem and the policies of the older imperialistic powers, and the more oppressive aspects of communism are ignored. America—associated as it is with racial discrimination and capitalism—is now in the position once occupied by the British Empire. As between American power and Russian power, a large part of the youth of Asia, even the Christian youth, would at present choose Russian power. The World Council promises to be a forum in which the continents will talk to each other. This is a new day for the Church. It has possibilities of more divisions and new bitterness, but it also has the possibility of a more equal world-wide community of Christians who, within the bonds of Christian fellowship and humbled under the God of all the continents, work through these problems together.

5. One final issue that has really been clarified in the discussion so far is the relationship between Christianity and freedom in society. Dr. Oldham has devoted a very helpful section of his paper to "The Free Society." No one quite likes that name, for what is intended for a free society is not a society that puts all of the emphasis upon freedom and neglects order and justice; such a society would soon lose its freedom. The word "democracy" without much explanation would hardly be a good designation either. And yet, there is in the world today a struggle to preserve something that our western democracies have achieved and of

which the leaders of the Soviet Union have little understanding. What is this something that is worth struggling for, and how is it related to Christianity? These are questions that will be much discussed at Amsterdam. The preparatory studies have already thrown much light on the questions so far as analysis is concerned. Dr. Oldham has given us, in connection with Commission III, one of the best statements of the issue that I have seen, but the subject will be discussed in several chapters in both the third and the fourth volumes. Mr. John Foster Dulles has written a paper for Commission IV which, while it naturally reflects the American tendency to give more emphasis to freedom than is now characteristic of European Christians, goes quite far to meet the position set forth by Dr. Oldham. Both show that the free society need not be based upon "free enterprise" in the American sense. I wish that I might summarize these papers, but they are still in their semiconfidential stage and no publication of their contents is permitted. Unfortunately, there are no contributions from eastern Europe except from Czechoslovakia, which is very much aware of its role as a mediator between east and west. We find this awareness among churchmen as well as among statesmen from that country. The strongest defenses of what would be the eastern rather than the western approach to political and economic problems come from Asia, though it should be emphasized that no one of the papers accepts communism as a total view of life and no one of them would reject the idea that there is a necessary connection between Christianity and some of the elements of freedom in the so-called "free society."

There is, of course, much more that could be said about these materials that have appeared in the preparation for Amsterdam, and I am under strict limitations in putting any discussion of them into print at this stage. Perhaps I have said enough to indicate that the issues that are raised in connection with Amsterdam are central ones for all thoughtful Christians and that the world-wide interchange about them may well produce some fresh results to guide the thought of Christians everywhere.

The Churches and International Affairs

O. FREDERICK NOLDE AND SARTELL PRENTICE, JR.

The Churches' Commission on International Affairs represents the World Council and the I. M. C. in relations with the United Nations—opportunity for a far-reaching Christian impact.

CAN THE PEOPLES of the world realistically place their confidence in the United Nations as an agency to build a world of peace, with order and justice? This question is raised with increasing insistence as controversial questions crowd the agenda of the Security Council and the General Assembly. Press and radio magnify immediately critical issues and picture international negotiations in terms of a football game or a prize fight. People are led to think of the United Nations primarily in terms of major unresolved problems such as relate to Greece, Korea, Palestine, the veto. In most instances, they see only a struggle between the U.S.S.R. and the United States with other member states lined up as supporting teams. They cheer a "diplomatic triumph" for their side and moan any loss of prestige or position.

The critical nature of international tensions cannot be ignored. However, a more penetrating understanding of the purposes and possibilities of the United Nations is imperatively needed. The full story has not been told when only the unresolved issues and the continuing difficulties have been recounted. Programs and activities of long-range import should be brought prominently to the fore. The concerted effort of the nations to attack the underlying causes of international disorder should be more thoroughly understood and more diligently supported.

Christians have a peculiar opportunity and a clear responsibility to undergird international action which is designed to be preventive and constructive. This is true for Christians as citizens of their several countries. Even more important in face of the world problem they confront is their task as members of a world-wide Christian fellowship. Organization for international Christian action has been initiated. The World Council of Churches and the International Missionary Council have jointly established a Commission of the Churches on International Affairs. This Commission was set up at Cambridge University in the summer of 1946. It was the outgrowth of the work undertaken by the church through Na-

tional Commissions during and immediately following the war. The contributions which Christians had made in connection with the formation of the United Nations gave rise to the conviction that the churches have a continuing responsibility in the field of world order. In order to present an effective Christian witness at the international level, it was deemed imperative to have an international Christian agency through which the work of the churches in different countries might be co-ordinated. For the first time in history there is now available a medium for concerting the resources of the non-Roman Christian world in the effort to promote world peace and justice.

Standing midway between the meeting of the I. M. C. at Whitby, Canada, in the summer of 1947 and the meeting of the W. C. C. at Amsterdam, Holland, in the summer of 1948, it seems appropriate to review some of the long-range plans of the United Nations and to emphasize the healthy possibilities of a Christian impact upon them. It is here that a source for Christian encouragement can be discerned. Christian optimism cannot be grounded upon any prospect of certain success. It is justified only in the knowledge that Christians, as individuals and in their corporate relations, are doing everything in their power to meet the needs of the world situation. The discussion of *long-range actions by the United Nations* and of the *international work of the churches* is here submitted as a stimulus to the more effective use of Christian resources, and, to the extent that this is brought about, as a source of hope in finding a solution for the perplexing problems of our time.

LONG-RANGE INTERNATIONAL ACTION

The basic and continuing task of the United Nations is not so much to resolve constantly recurring crises as it is to create conditions throughout the world under which such crises will not arise. This can readily be seen in the four major purposes set forth in the United Nations Charter: (1) to maintain peace and security by suppressing aggression and by settling disputes peacefully; (2) to recognize the equal rights of people and to develop friendly relations among the nations; (3) to achieve co-operation in striking at the root causes of war—economic, social, cultural, and humanitarian—and in promoting respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms; (4) to offer a center or agency for harmonizing the actions of nations in attaining common ends. While provision is here made to deal with immediately critical issues, it is apparent that much of the work of the United Nations shall be preventive and constructive.

The organs designed for the accomplishment of long-range purposes have actually been established and are now in operation.

The Economic and Social Council has seriously undertaken its assignment with respect to international economic, social, cultural, educational, health, and related matters. On the basis of studies which it has initiated, recommendations have been made which will, if effectively carried out, relieve many of the current tensions and conflicts. Much of the work of the Council is carried on through the commissions which it is authorized to create. Mere mention of these will indicate the scope of its activities: Human Rights, Status of Women, Economic and Employment, Statistical, Social, Transport and Communications. A number of subcommissions have also been established.

At the second half of the General Assembly's first session, eight trusteeship agreements were approved. Following this action, the Trusteeship Council was organized and its initial activities were undertaken. A provisional draft of an Inquiry has been drawn with a view to bringing to the United Nations information about the manner in which the trust authorities are fulfilling their obligations. Accordingly, steps are under way to accomplish the purposes of the trusteeship system. The political, economic, social, and educational advancement of inhabitants in the trust territories has been accepted as an international responsibility. The nations recognize their obligation to promote progressive development toward self-government or independence.

The International Court of Justice is available to the nations to render decision on any case which may properly be submitted to it. While its activities have thus far been limited, every indication points to an increasing use of its judicial services not only by member states, but also by various organs of the United Nations.

Many specialized agencies have come into being and have formally established relations with the United Nations. An impression of the long-range tasks here undertaken may be gained merely by glancing at the official titles of some of these organizations: United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization; International Labor Organization; International Refugee Organization; Food and Agricultural Organization; International Monetary Fund; and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

The General Assembly stands as a co-ordinating agency for the varied activities of the United Nations. All member states are members of the Assembly. Every nation, large and small, has equal voice and equal

vote. The General Assembly at its recent session has addressed itself to many of the most serious controversial problems with which the world is faced. People far and wide have been disturbed by the inability of the Assembly to reach unanimous decisions. Despair should give way to encouragement in the knowledge that the problems were publicly and courageously debated, and that decision to take action was reached in most instances by substantial majorities.

In appraising the initial success of the United Nations, fair consideration must be given to all its activities. The crucial issues of the moment must not be allowed to obscure the steady undercurrent of effort in behalf of world peace and order. The danger of conflict arising from immediate tensions must be taken into account. However, if a sufficiently long period of time is allowed for constructive activities to make their impact, the nations may learn to live and to work together, and the causes of international irritation may thus be counteracted.

INTERNATIONAL WORK OF THE CHURCHES

Christians are concerned with all constructive international action which is bent upon a peaceful and orderly world. The Commission of the Churches on International Affairs is authorized in its Charter to represent the World Council of Churches and the International Missionary Council in relations with international bodies such as the United Nations and related agencies. The Commission is intended to maintain such contacts with these bodies as will assist in (a) the progressive development and codification of international law; (b) the encouragement of respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms, special attention being given to the problem of religious liberty; (c) the international regulation of armaments; (d) the furtherance of international economic co-operation; (e) acceptance by all nations of the obligation to promote to the utmost the well-being of dependent peoples, including their advance toward self-government and the development of their free political institutions; (f) the promotion of international social, cultural, educational, and humanitarian enterprises.

While interested in all activities of the United Nations, the churches obviously have greater concern and more specialized competence in those areas where human relations are prominent. To illustrate the kind of Christian activity which is going on at the international level, the activities of the Commission of the Churches in relation to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights are here briefly recounted. In considering

this development, it should be remembered that the nations of the world are seeking action which has no precedent in history. The authority to recognize or deny man's rights and freedoms has traditionally been placed in national states. The effort now under way to cultivate an international responsibility for the well-being of man may be ranked with the most significant achievements of our day.

Dumbarton Oaks to San Francisco.

The Dumbarton Oaks Proposals for the charter of a world organization contained only brief and subordinate reference to human rights and fundamental freedoms. In the period between October, 1944, when the Proposals were made public, and April, 1945, when the Conference on World Organization was convened at San Francisco, strong popular sentiment was aroused to remedy this defect. Christians in a number of countries were active in their efforts to secure in the final draft of the Charter more adequate provisions to safeguard human rights. Church leaders in at least four countries which were to be represented at San Francisco petitioned their national delegates to support the establishment of a Commission on Human Rights. An international Christian influence thus played a determining part in achieving the more extensive provisions for human rights and fundamental freedoms which ultimately found their way into the Charter.

The Preamble of the Charter, written in the name of the peoples of the United Nations, expresses determination to "reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small." One of the major purposes of the organization shall be "to achieve international co-operation . . . in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion" (Art. 1, Sec. 3). The Charter relates this purpose to the functions and powers of the General Assembly (Art. 13, Sec. 1, B), of the Economic and Social Council (Art. 62, Sec. 2), and lists it among the basic objectives of the International Trusteeship System (Art. 76, Sec. c). The Economic and Social Council is required "to set up commissions in economic and social fields and *for the promotion of human rights*" (Art. 68).

Commission on Human Rights.

The fact that the establishment of a Commission on Human Rights

is mandatory evidently centers in it the primary responsibility for "promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms." Accordingly, Christian leaders in a number of countries encouraged the prompt establishment of this Commission and sought to point out important responsibilities which the Commission could rightfully assume. The extensive similarities between a memorandum on the composition and competence of the proposed Commission on Human Rights, submitted by the Joint Committee on Religious Liberty, and the terms of reference which were finally accepted by the United Nations, bespeak the extent to which this work was successful.

International Bill of Human Rights.

The United Nations Charter accepted the goal of promoting universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion. It did not define or enumerate the rights and freedoms which should be recognized. Accordingly, one of the first tasks undertaken by the Commission on Human Rights was to prepare recommendations for an International Bill. In March, 1947, the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs submitted to the United Nations Secretariat a memorandum on provisions for religious liberty in an International Bill of Rights. Emphasis was laid on the need to interpret religious liberty to include all the rights and freedoms which are necessary to the full exercise of religion. To illustrate this inclusive concept, a list of rights and freedoms was compiled from the Oxford and Madras reports and from statements issued by national church groups.

A committee appointed by the Commission on Human Rights to prepare initial drafts was convened at Lake Success in June, 1947. The Commission of the Churches was represented by an observer or consultant at every meeting and a statement on the inadequacy of provisions for worship without other forms of religious expression was submitted. Informal conversations were held with most members of the Drafting Committee. The findings of the committee were produced in the form of two working papers, one on a declaration and the other on a convention. The article for religious freedom proposed for the declaration here follows:

"Individual freedom of thought and conscience, to hold or change beliefs, is an absolute and sacred right.

"The practice of a private or public worship, religious observances, and manifestations of differing convictions can be subject only to such

RELIGION IN LIFE

limitations as are necessary to protect public order, morals, and the rights and freedoms of others."

The article included in the convention and also proposed as an alternative text for the declaration reads:

"1. Every person shall be free to hold any religious or other belief dictated by his conscience and to change his belief.

"2. Every person shall be free to practice, either alone or in community with other persons of like mind, any form of religious worship and observance, subject only to such restrictions, penalties, or liabilities as are strictly necessary to prevent the commission of acts which offend laws passed in the interests of humanity and morals, to preserve public order, and to ensure the rights and freedoms of other persons.

"3. Subject only to the same restrictions, every person of full age and sound mind shall be free to give and receive any form of religious teaching and to endeavor to persuade other persons of full age and sound mind of the truth of his beliefs, and in the case of a minor the parent or guardian shall be free to determine what religious teaching he shall receive."

The Executive Committee of the Commission of the Churches, following consultations at Geneva, Switzerland, and Whitby, Canada, submitted to the United Nations a memorandum on provisions for religious liberty contained in the working papers. Extensive excerpts from this memorandum are here quoted to illustrate the manner in which the position of the churches is adjusted to an existing level of international negotiation.

"The Executive Committee of the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs welcomes the information that the United Nations Commission on Human Rights is proceeding to draft an International Bill of Human Rights and finds encouragement in the significant progress which has thus far been made. The considerations in this memorandum are prompted by the discussions and findings of the Drafting Committee at its session, June 9-25, 1947. . . .

"The statements here following relate the views of the churches represented in the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs to the present stage of negotiation in drafting an International Bill of Human Rights.

"I

"We believe that both a declaration and a convention or conventions are needed. We address ourselves at this time especially to the provisions

for religious liberty in an International Declaration on Human Rights with the understanding that the provisions of the Declaration shall be made more explicit in a Convention.

"II

"We support the principle that a Declaration of this character, when adopted by the General Assembly, carries an obligation upon all Member States to comply with its provisions.

"III

"An International Declaration on Human Rights, in its provisions for religious liberty, should recognize man's right both to freedom of conscience and freedom of expression.

"Accordingly, the Declaration on Human Rights should explicitly state that:

"*1. Individual freedom of thought and conscience to hold or to change beliefs is an absolute and sacred right.*

"Comment: We understand that the right to change beliefs may be considered as implicit in the right to hold beliefs. However, unless the right to change beliefs is clearly recognized, freedom of conscience may under some circumstances become meaningless. We are therefore convinced that explicit provision should be made for the right to change as well as to hold beliefs. We note with satisfaction that both the original and the alternate texts for Article 20 contain this provision.

"*2. Every person, either individually or in association with others, has the right to express beliefs in worship, teaching, propagation, and practice, subject only to such limitations as are strictly necessary to prevent the violation of laws passed in the interest of community well-being and to ensure the equal rights and freedoms of other persons.*

"Comment: The term *worship* is variously interpreted in a restricted and an inclusive sense. For this reason, we emphatically urge that it should not be used as a synonym for religious freedom. If the term *worship* is used, it should be accompanied by an enumeration of other ways in which beliefs can be expressed. If such an enumeration is deemed inadvisable in a Declaration, a general term should be used which will obviously cover all essential manifestations of beliefs.

"At all events, the Declaration should unmistakably recognize the interrelationship between Article 20 on religious freedom and other Articles which bear on the exercise of religious freedom; for example, Articles 21

to 25 in the present draft. This need can be met by a cross reference in Article 20 or by a general statement in the Preamble. The latter expedient would seem preferable because it would care for all cases of interrelationship. If the substance of Article 6 of the Draft Declaration is placed in the Preamble, as has been suggested in the discussion of the Drafting Committee, it could be amended to provide that 'the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, *both separately and in their essential relationship with each other*, shall apply to every person and shall be respected and observed without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.'

The schedule adopted by the Economic and Social Council called for the consideration of these working papers at the next meeting of the Commission on Human Rights to be held at Geneva beginning December 1, 1947. As the governments were preparing reactions to the working papers for the declaration and the convention, the churches in several countries took occasion to express their conception of the manner in which freedom of religion should be safeguarded. The Commission of the Churches was represented at the Geneva meeting by its consultant.

There is no way of forecasting the extent to which this important venture will be successful. In all probability, no form now under consideration will be sustained through the long process of negotiation which lies ahead. If the Geneva meeting of the Commission on Human Rights reaches a conclusion with respect to a declaration or a convention, or both, the procedure then will involve (a) submission of these drafts to all member states of the United Nations for their observance, suggestions, and appraisals; (b) consideration of this observance as a basis of a redraft if necessary by the Drafting Committee; (c) submission of the resulting draft of the Commission on Human Rights for final consideration; (d) consideration of the proposed Bill by the Economic and Social Council with a view to recommending it to the General Assembly in 1948. This schedule may be somewhat optimistic. A longer period of time may be required before a recommendation can be considered by the General Assembly. At all events, the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs, as well as national committees of the churches, will seek to maintain close contact with this highly important development.

THE COMMISSION OF THE CHURCHES AND AMSTERDAM

The work of the Commission of the Churches in the field of human rights has been cited as one illustration. As can readily be understood, this

phase of its activity is considered of basic importance. However, within the scope of its activities are included many other issues of international concern; for example, trusteeship problems, development and codification of international law, genocide, UNESCO, peace treaties.

One of the immediate tasks before the Commission is to develop a two-way line of communication between the United Nations and the churches in different lands. Information about the proposals and activities of the United Nations must be brought to the people in the context of their religious faith. This is necessary in order that an enlightened public opinion may be formed. Further, the people must have an avenue through which they know their points of view will command attention of leaders in the United Nations. This is required in order that enlightened public opinion, undergirded by religious conviction, can be made vocal. An experimental procedure is now under way with a view to co-ordinating the resources of the non-Roman Christian world for international action.

In preparation for the Amsterdam Conference, the Study Department of the World Council of Churches has designated the Commission of the Churches as Commission IV, with responsibility for a volume on "The Churches and International Affairs." While the contents of the volume are subject to revision, the chapter headings will indicate the scope of the projected study:

1. The Churches and World Order.
2. Antagonisms and Alignments in a Changing World.
3. Human Rights and Religious Liberty.
4. The Work of the Churches in International Affairs.
5. Continuing Christian Responsibility in a Changing World.

The Commission of the Churches on International Affairs has now been in existence for about a year and a half. It has a membership of twenty-six commissioners from all over the world and its officers are citizens of four different countries. Its parent bodies include in their constituencies a substantial segment of the non-Roman Christian world. The work which the Commission has thus far undertaken represents only a beginning of what should progressively become a powerful force in representing the Christian mind to the world of nations. Through its instrumentality, in co-operation with national commissions of the churches and individual Christians of every land, the affirmative and long-range activities of the United Nations can be made to increase in number and to obscure in significance the tensions and controversial issues which today hold the limelight.

“That Queer Sect”—The Quakers

SEAL THOMPSON

The Society of Friends seeks first of all to be true to the Inner Light—and strangely enough it has become “a problem child in the household of faith.”

A FEW MONTHS back the writer sat at a well-appointed academic dinner table in the middle west and said something about the Society of Friends. “Who are they?” queried a guest at my right. My host answered, “Oh, they’re a queer sect that S. belongs to.” This, to a little Philadelphia provincial, was blasphemy, no less! Another voice, meant to be kindly, was heard, “I saw one, once, in Geneva.” A young acquaintance, teaching American history in one of our enlightened public schools, coming to the Pennsylvania settlement by Friends, heard a voice raised in wonder, “Did you ever really *see* one?”

To one used all her life to “thee” and “thou,” to enforced memorization of Whittier, to plain bonnets, even to twirling thumbs, to *Faith and Practice*, to Friends’ testimony for every form of service that makes for reconciliation, this was incredible. She distinctly remembers when she first heard of St. Augustine, but she cannot recall first intimacy with George Fox and John Woolman and Elizabeth Fry. If asked, she perhaps would have said naïvely that they were founders of Christianity, or at least senior partners in that memorable enterprise. Now, having lived so long among the elect—honest-to-goodness Calvinists and members of the Church—she has learned, theologically speaking, to mind her manners, though with maturity (perhaps perversity) original convictions tend to deepen.

In this sophisticated milieu she has learned that the Society of Friends is a kind of problem child in the household of faith. Not Catholic. No. For there is the Pope and the Celebration and Authority, though, as a matter of fact, affiliation between Friends and Catholics is sometimes easier than between Friends and—but “I name me no names.” And yet Friends are not Protestants, for there, again, is the Authority, with the accent to be sure on a different syllable. There is the “hired ministry,” the glory of a musical service, and oh, a creed. And there, in the shadow, is the Calvinist, with his staggering polysyllabic Transcendence,

to whom immanence is a bitter brew. It is not strange that a voice was heard at the Edinburgh Conference on Faith and Order: "But what *can* we do with these Quaker delegates? They do *seem* good people." Despite all this, the Friend dares assume that he, too, is a pilgrim on the King's highway, though he knows—for he has been told so often and persecuted in the bargain—that he must not be too sure.

At the moment, because of unsought publicity, one finds fulfillment of the ancient prophecy "as unknown and yet well known." Partly responsible is the Nobel Peace award, so welcome, so gratefully accepted. Friends are receiving more adulation than is good for their soul's health. They are aware. They know that humility is "the cowslip in the hand"—imperishable flower of paradise. They have learned, not from Mr. Chesterton but from experience, that "Alice must be a very little Alice if she would enter wonderland"; they are convinced, with the poet, that

The only wisdom we can hope to acquire
Is the wisdom of humility: humility is endless.¹

I

An immortal phrase is a thing. Mr. Micawber is with us because he "is waiting for something to turn up." Arthur Ashmore will never outlive the fact that "his face looked like a page of wide margins and no punctuation." Mary Webb well knew that no further introduction was needed than "He spends his whole life trying to convince people that oleomargarine is just as good as butter." Even without the Old Testament narrative Moses would be held in remembrance by the legend, to "endure as seeing him who is invisible." The Quaker rubric is "the Inner Light."

Those three words hold the kernel of the Quaker faith. The tradition so expressed was first articulated in the seventeenth century in England by George Fox, but the forces that produced it had been set in motion at least a century earlier; moreover, it was greatly influenced by current seventeenth-century thought. So high an authority as T. R. Glover has said that by the seventeenth century the Reformation had "frayed out" because of political and scholastic interests, and had it not been for John Bunyan and George Fox we might never have known what the Reformation meant. Certainly, in the words of the English essayist, "the Reformation came to flower in very different ways, for John Bunyan and George

¹T. S. Eliot: "East Coker" in *Four Quartets*, Harcourt, Brace & Company, Inc., 1943. Used by permission.

Fox did not see eye to eye. One of them persists today through a book; the other through a society.”²

Much has been written about both of these men; not enough about a great characteristic which each possessed, namely, the intention and the ability to be absolutely honest about the things of the spirit. A rare intention! A still rarer achievement! Nothing is more tempting than to dramatize, in retrospect, a spiritual moment.

In Maeterlinck's play, elfish celestial children flit hither and thither on the borderland between time and eternity, selecting, with caprice and abandon, those human beings in whom they wish to be incarnated. If there be truth in this phantasy, certainly no better choice for incarnation could have been made than George Fox, for this reason above every other, that he was an honest man. To be honest spiritually is to be great, with or without herald. This inconvenient veracity — to opponents having nuisance value chiefly — has been the bulwark of Quakerism, though it has sometimes found expression in trivial and amusing ways. Witness John Woolman, pruning his fruit trees on the now historic New Jersey farm. A neighbor, strolling by, cried out: “John, you can't save that tree. It's full of caterpillars.” “Not *quite* full,” said John sweetly, and finished his pruning. Therein, perhaps, a parable. This same fidelity led the early Friends, in homage to the fact, and perhaps encouraged by a community unwilling to accept the appraisal, to change their name *Children of Light* to *The Society of Friends*. Thus did experience triumph over hope. In more profound ways this spirit of truth has been the buttress of the Quaker structure. George Fox, not a perfect man, could have said with *Job*, “Here is my signature . . . until I die I will not put away mine integrity.” His tortured soul, torn by bewildering doubts, persistently refused to accept for the sake of solace that which he could not wholeheartedly believe.

It was in 1643 that George Fox began his solitary search for truth. For four years he wandered through the English midlands interviewing the elect, without benefit from clergy. The Puritans of the time believed that “God had spoken through the Scripture and through the *finished* work of Christ and that no further revelation would be available until the second advent. The business of the church was to teach man a plan of salvation external to his life and experience.” The truth that broke upon George Fox, as he plodded over the dour hills, was that God speaks

²I believe this statement to be from T. R. Glover, but have been unable to locate it.

directly to the individual soul, without mediation of priest or book or liturgy or sacrament. "There is one," he cried out, "that speaks to my condition." Hence, Quakerism started not with a doctrine, but with an experience. At once Fox made the assumption—too easy an assumption some may think—that there must have been something *in* him to speak *to*; otherwise, he would not have recognized this dialect of the fatherland. And being a man of humility, he made the further assumption that what was true of him was true of all men. So it was that George Fox came from that august moment with the firm conviction that "there is that of God in *every man*."

In that brief sentence lies a basic conviction of Friends. Looking out on men candidly with their cruelty, their failure, their stupidity, their sin, George Fox cried out, "But I saw the light shine through all." Herein a fresh type of mysticism, "growing out of an exact imagination." It had far-reaching consequences. Here is rooted that faith which has sent Friends on their round-the-world ministry—a ministry important chiefly because of its *raison d'être*. It is the reason underlying the humanitarian work of the Society that gives it significance. Friends are aware, as was the eighth-century prophet, that the real world famine is not of bread but of "the words of the Lord."

Hence, as F. rolled her food-laden truck to the door of a children's barracks on the continent, and heard the shrill voices of the children, who had spied the red-and-black star, crying "The Quakers are here! the Quakers are here!", she said to her companion, "First, we must tell them *why* we are here." "Can thee?" he said, "they are just hungry children." She smiled. "I'm not out to discuss the Incarnation or Atonement or Original Sin." "Children," she said very simply, "before we give you the *chocolat* we want you to know that you and we belong to each other, we love each other 'more than tongue can tell'; we know what love is because the dear Master has put love into all of our hearts. And so we bring you a gift." Did they understand? Of course. Did they remember? That is a question the Friend does not ask. The Friend knows his calling—to be a clear channel for the love of God. "Beware," says William Penn, "lest thou throw a weir across the stream and obstruct the current." The Friend's task is, as George Fox enjoined, "to walk cheerfully over the earth, answering that of God in every man."

"For us there is only the trying: the rest is not our business."¹⁸

¹⁸T. S. Eliot: "East Coker."

It is because of this deeply held tenet that Friends are constrained, in the Pauline sense, to those social activities for which they are "well known." Perhaps you are thinking that, like T. S. Eliot's archbishop, "they do the right thing for the wrong reason." Ponder this: they go not with the sense of sin but with the sense of God. Is not the haunting problem of evil intrinsically the problem of good? To be saved is to be loved, *n'est-ce pas?* Incredible?

"Were the love of God less simple, we would take him at his word." So, as the Friend goes his way, he must, in his own quaint phrase "keep close to the root," "keep close to the seed," "obey the inner light." Otherwise the cherished *chocolat* will have lost its essential flavor. He must go his way only under that constraint. "Do you," say his queries, "seek the right course of action in humble submission to the authority of truth?" Those who have tried urgency have found themselves out of breath to no purpose. When the Friend says, "I have a stop in my mind," persuasion is futile. When he says, "The cloud is lifted from the tabernacle," nothing will stop him, no matter how perilous the enterprise.

In 1918 the cloud was lifted from the tabernacle. Constraint led to the continent. It is a familiar tale. It meant the feeding, at the peak, of over a million children a day. It meant going into war-stricken Vienna with eight hundred cows in order that hospitalized children could be supplied with milk. It meant the construction of a maternity hospital in France. It meant taking food to the famine-stricken areas in Russia. In the middle twenties, with the apparent return of prosperity, it seemed time to light the lamp. But no, not yet.

I was certain my wanderings were over, and my debt was paid
When suddenly I came upon thy trumpet lying in the dust.⁴

The Friends have taken up the trumpet lying in the dust. They have started afresh, to Germany, to Vienna, to Finland, to France, opening feeding centers for sufferers. They have opened distributing centers in Philadelphia and New York and New England for the hundreds of refugees on their lists. They are in our own Delta, living with share-croppers, sharing not only crops but problems and burdens.

May I say again, it is not so much a matter of being there: it is *why* they are there. Some time ago a professor in one of our large universities laid a new pavement in front of his house, whereupon two gay little sprites darted across it, leaving footprints in the soft material.

⁴ Rabindranath Tagore: *Poems*.

Promptly their mother was appealed to, to curb this activity. Plaintively she replied, "But Doctor J., I thought you liked little children." "I do," he replied dryly, "in the abstract but not in the concrete." The Friend knows he must take his faith both in the abstract and in the concrete. His inner light demands both.

II

A young seeker asks, What does the Friend mean by that phrase, constantly used, the *Inner Light*?

Here begins a search for words to express that which is "in time" and "out of time." One finds oneself, like the poet:

Trying to learn the use of words, and every attempt
Is a wholly new start and a different kind of failure.⁵

The Friend is loath to engage in this raid on the inarticulate, not only because of antecedent failures, but also because he well knows that authenticity lies not in words but in life. Those who go back to the Philadelphia apple-dumpling era will perhaps pardon the homely metaphor, "The proof of the pudding is in the eating and not in chewing the string," heard too often for comfort when facile words were offered as a substitute for selfless service. The Friend knows—as do many others—what he means by this inner illumination but he has no idiom. Again, paraphrasing the poet, "He can only say: *There I have been.*" Perhaps the English Friend has put it well, in a pamphlet written several years ago:

Now this ceaseless and universal prompting to unite ourselves with a wider life and fellowship, guiding our endeavors and checking our departures from the true way of life—this is what the Quaker calls the *Inner Light*. What else was meant by the first Quakers who used the expression "inward light" than this divine and inspiring presence that calls each human heart to its true life and nature and recalls each wandering spirit from its wanderings?⁶

The Inner Light is not to be identified with reason "though it does not exclude reason; nor with conscience, which it uses; nor with instinctive urges and intuition," which it sometimes verifies, sometimes denies. It is not a human product; it is a diviner thing; it is that which enables the individual to discern spiritual truth. It is *given*. It is authoritative. To live within its radiance is to share the glory, "to be transformed into the same image." So to dwell is an essential *discipline*. One "must go by a way wherein there is no ecstasy."⁵

⁵ T. S. Eliot: "East Coker."

⁶ Barratt Brown, *Universal Light*, London.

Now the Lord opened to me by his invisible power that every man was enlightened by the divine light of Christ, and I saw it shine through all; and that they that believed it came out of condemnation to the light of life and became the children of it.⁷

This inner divineness has sometimes been identified with Paul's indwelling Christ, sometimes not. One would not dogmatize. The Friend is content to say that, for himself, he finds that reality must be interiorly sought and he fearlessly affirms that, being sought within, it may be found of all men. *This affirmation no Friend can abandon and retain his integrity.* This capacity to partake of the divine nature (exemplified so perfectly by Jesus, "the pioneer") may easily go unrealized; it may be betrayed by willfulness; but it is *there*, always. Hence the Friend is not likely to say with Paul, "There is none righteous, no, not one"; but rather, There is none that is without goodness, no, not one. He is less likely to speak about "being carnal and sold under sin" and more prone to repeat, "I and the Father are one." An audacious assumption! Yes, but as one proceeds to build one's thought and practice upon it, one is overwhelmed with a sense of validity. The centuries have proved that this is not shallow optimism.

Through a long history, Friends have moved farther and farther away from any outward authority. Experience, not theory, has brought convincing evidence that every man has it in his essential nature to be the true image of God—nay, more than a mere ikon. Hence, may the Friend be understood if he thinks less in terms of *the Incarnation* and more in terms of incarnation; less of *the Atonement* and more of atonement, to which, if he be truly a Friend, he is dedicated. Much daring, he conceives of "the Word made flesh" as not only a first-century phenomenon but as that which repeats itself, over and over, as the spirit of God is recognized in men's hearts. This is God's gift of grace. This, of course, is not the whole truth about God; it is not to deny his transcendence; it is not to claim infallibility. Never shall we "be able to measure infinite love by limited knowledge." It will eternally be true that

. . . . we are but on the outskirts of his ways
And how small a whisper do we hear of him.⁸

It is where the Friend casts his anchor. It is this belief—may I say experience?—that makes the Quaker feel discomfort with Calvinism, "a system of thought which rigidly separates the human and the divine."

⁷ George Fox: *Journal*.

⁸ Job 26:14.

III

Quaker disrelish for creed stems back to assurance that fresh revelations await obedient followers. "He that willeth to do shall know." Hence, no static creed is adequate. Like the scribe, the Friend takes from his treasure house things new and old. No final formula can possibly cover progressive illumination. Revelation was not closed out in the first century, nor will it be in the twentieth. "The Lord has yet more truth to break out of his holy word," said John Robinson to the Pilgrim Fathers, as they started on their perilous quest.

But absence of creed does not leave the Friend orphaned. For here are the *Epistles* and the *Advices and Queries*. In the *Epistles*, issued annually by various Yearly Meetings, one may "find the nearest approach to a religious creed as well as a moral programme." The Friend may well ponder—and indeed does—these excerpts from the London Yearly Meeting *Epistle* of 1947:

The significant thing about a Meeting for Worship is that it is where we meet God together. . . .

Worship is not so much an attitude of mind, which we cultivate, as a response drawn *from us* by a consciousness of God's presence. The silence will be rich as we feel the word, "Be still and know that I am God."

God lays his hand upon thee; he calls thee to lay aside every weight, to mind that which is pure in thee, to guide thee to him, to follow wherever he shall lead.

And none can overestimate the deep searching of heart with which each Friend must make his response to the *Advices and Queries*, the earliest form of which was issued in 1656. From that time on the *Advices and Queries*, frequently revised, have been sent to Friends "to be used as a means of self-examination," with, however, "the clear recognition that conduct does not consist in an outward set of rules." The 1943 issue of the *Advices* contains:

Take heed, dear Friends, to the promptings of love and truth in your hearts, which are the leadings of the Holy Spirit of God. Resist not the strivings within you. It is his light that shows us our darkness and leads to true repentance. . . .

Yield yourselves up to the influence of the Divine presence so that you may find the evil weakening in you and the good raised up. . . .

Still deeper probe the *Queries*, touching every frontage of life:

Do you come faithfully to meetings for worship, with heart and mind prepared, entering into fellowship one with another, seeking reverently to know communion with God and refreshment of spirit?

Do you make a place in your daily life for inward retirement and waiting upon

God, that you may learn the full meaning of prayer and the joy of communion with him? Do you live in daily dependence upon his help and guidance?

Are you striving to develop your mental powers and to use them to the glory of God?

Do you, as disciples of the Lord Jesus, take a lively interest in the social conditions of those around you? Do you seek to understand the causes of social evils and to take your right share in the endeavor to remove them?

These are not rhetorical questions. In his own upper room each Friend must give his answer. Later the answers are summarized and sent, of course anonymously, to Yearly Meeting.

Still another discipline has helped the Society to escape pernicious individualism, namely, the custom of laying an individual "concern" before the Monthly Meeting. This, as the writer knows, is a humbling experience. One moves slowly before he submits his "concern" to the sober scrutiny of his Meeting, though he is at perfect liberty, if he desires, to set aside its judgment.

Despite absence of mass, of chalice, of priestly office, the Friend belongs to one of the highly sacramental groups. He believes that he is "one with God," a unity consummated not in any one moment of time but a relationship which is unbroken. The "chalice of the grapes of God" is partaken of interiorly; not at the sound of the sanctus bell but in a silence in which—sometimes alone, sometimes corporately—the Presence is so very real that the Friend knows indeed that "he is *there*." At this point, though without celebration, the Friend merits understanding from his Catholic fellow-Christian. The *realization* of this unity is the basis of the Friends' Meeting for Worship.

What has saved this silent worship from "dryness" and "quietism"? One hastens to add that it has not always been so saved. The treasure is in earthen vessels. As every contemplative well knows, the self can and does set up a great clamor even in the holy of holies. Especially is this true if, in advance of coming to Meeting, one has failed to live, as the *Queries* urge, in daily dependence upon the help and guidance of God. Meeting must begin, as the Friend is often reminded, before he gets there.

Another saving factor lies in the Quaker insistence not only upon the character but also upon the *implications* of this knitting together of the human and divine. The Christian faith has always been, and always will be, in the keeping of those who accept its disciplinary inferences. Dear Katherine Mansfield was heard to say, "I went upstairs to pray and could not, because I had not done my work." Every true Christian

knows about this. The Friend has never been permitted to overlook the demands of this entwinement with the infinite. He is, thereby, committed to a life of atonement. Lost as a form of greeting, but uppermost always in the consciousness of the Friend, is the simple query, "*Art thou faithful?*"

Being a mere layman, I find it hard to distinguish between good theology and bad, if those adjectives be permitted. But I have a strong suspicion, confirmed by caustic reminders from Barthian friends, that the Society of Friends is not theologically in the A class. However, if I may burn a little incense at our own shrine, I think we are pretty good psychologists—in emphasis on the deeper areas of life (Freud's subconscious was not front-page news to the Friend); in reliance on the potentiality of his fellow men; and in careful selection of those interests which he allows to play upon his life. Here, culturally, he has sometimes had to count off his losses. Be this as it may, every man must select his own working hypothesis. The Friend has chosen allegiance, "in faith and practice," to that "light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world."

Decentralization—Restoring Society at Its Roots

MILDRED JENSEN LOOMIS

Decentralists, with emphasis on family, land, and small community, are working out a concrete program—against the trend toward centralized industry.

SOCIETY IS SICK, and millions of people are either hoping or searching for a remedy. Suggested cures are not lacking, with some being tried out in various spots on the globe. Common to most of these solutions is faith in Western technological civilization. Modern society, they posit, is satisfactory in essence; all that is needed is some shift in economic relationships or political administration. With Arnold Toynbee, most present-day reformers believe political states may come and go, but industrialism will go on forever.

Decentralists are not so confident. In fact, they believe the roots of society—the family, the home, and the neighborhood—are dead, and that it is industrialism that has killed them; that modern society can only continue to disintegrate until these roots are restored and the slayer of them eradicated. Man's folk life and all that gives people roots in a patch of earth and a human family, along with the psychic security this brings, have been strangled by the centralization required by modern industrialism. Man can be true to his nature—can grow and develop—only when his primary associations are again healthy and normal.

Decentralists really believe what the Malvern conference declared, that "the *family* is the most significant and should be the best-guarded unit in society." They are serious about a program which would bring to modern families all the creative activities, responsibilities, and unity which the home of fifty years ago had, plus the advantages of modern technology and psychology. They insist that "the small community is the seedbed of civilization," and since the village today is merely something that has been pushed aside by forces creating "the larger society," they are at work to restore the community as the focal point of a vital culture.

One of the earliest and perhaps now the outstanding proponent of decentralization in our country is Ralph Borsodi, best known for his in-

dictment of modern culture in *This Ugly Civilization*.¹ There he showed how the mass-producing factory system—along with its handmaiden, large-scale advertising—produced a nation of quantity-minded, standardized masses. Mr. Borsodi knew his subject. For years he had been in the vortex of commercialism, counseling Macy's Department Store, The American Spool Cotton Co., and some of the largest firms of the country on their advertising budgets and outlays. He had watched the effects of the machine, the factory, and advertising on the workers in industry as well as the folk in the hinterland. In 1921 his scientific study, *The Distribution Age*,² was one of the earliest statements of the unbalance between primary production (of food, clothing, and shelter) and the secondary services of distribution. He showed that the more highly centralized production becomes—and the farther removed the factory is from its source of raw materials and its consuming public—the higher grows the cost of distribution. In fact, for many articles of mass production the savings made by factory production per unit is offset by increased distribution charges, so that the final price paid by consumers shows no advantage from this system over local or home production.

This significant economic fact suggested to Mr. Borsodi a solution which he proceeded to test out. In 1921 he moved out of the city to establish a modern homestead—a home on a small plot of land, where the family could produce most or all of its food, clothing, and shelter. On "Seven Acres" near Suffern, New York, Mr. and Mrs. Borsodi built and constructed, gardened, cooked, canned, sewed, and worked their loom. They found that this way of life saved them money and raised their standard of living. But they also found it creatively satisfying, a real education to them and their two little boys, and a source of security and independence of which previously they had only dreamed. Later they enlarged their enterprise on seventeen acres, where of native stones they built with their own hands a large homestead-house and several cottages for other members of the family. These activities they described in *Flight from the City*.³

Inquiries and visits from readers of these books were heavy and continuous. Questions were so numerous that Mr. Borsodi saw the need for an education in this way of living. In fact, as he pondered the human being, Mr. Borsodi saw that the great mistake modern man had made

¹ Simon and Schuster, 1928.

² D. Appleton and Company.

³ Third edition published in 1947, \$2.75 from School of Living Press, Suffern, N. Y.

was to moor the machine in the factory and let it twist and warp his nature out of shape. "Normal man," said Mr. Borsodi, "must live in and for his home. A home is a mere shell if it does not carry on economic and productive activities. The proper way to use the machine is to domesticate it—fit it to the home, family, and neighborhood. Let man be master of the machine—go to it when he needs it. Let him cease being slave to the factory that compels him to come and go by a punch clock. Let man be in charge of tools that help him do *his* work, not a cog helping machines do *their* work. Let man choose and plan, think and decide, imagine and design—all in his daily work. In fact, let men be men, using all the capacities with which they are endowed."

Out of such living and thinking grew a new philosophy of normal living. From it developed The School of Living, founded near Suffern, New York, in 1934. There, for some years, were carried on experiments in home and community building. There groups met for the discussion of the principles and practices of normal living. There was formed a publishing company to circulate decentralist books, and there is soon to be released the first of three volumes on *Education and Living*. In these volumes Mr. Borsodi is making a full report of the findings of the school's experiments, as well as an explicit definition of thirteen major problems of living, along with suggested solutions. Here also Mr. Borsodi defines Decentralization and outlines the concept as it has grown to become a significant social philosophy.

DECENTRALIZATION DEFINED

To understand decentralization, one must first be clear about what Centralization involves. "Centralization," says Mr. Borsodi, "is that method of implementation—of planned action—in which control of any of the activities of the individual or of the people as a whole, whether the activities be industrial, financial, educational, political, or religious, is concentrated in the hands of fewer and fewer people."

Centralization predominates today, and its overwhelming majority of advocates support it on the grounds of efficiency and progress. Our high standard of living, argue the centralizers, rests on the factory use of modern technology and mass production. They are therefore necessary and indispensable. To get such efficiency we must concentrate large units of money and capital, and people must be concentrated in large units of population. And since big business and huge financial combines demand

large and powerful government units to direct them, we'll do with centralized federal regulation, and if need be, government ownership. In order to get the tremendous output of factories distributed, we need large-scale advertising and selling, and for the sake of many goods and modern conveniences we will submit to the standardization of taste and usage. To this end we'll shape our educational system, too, asking it to prepare youth for jobs in this centralized system.

Decentralization is the exact opposite of all this. But it is not merely a negation; it is a positive philosophy of living.

"Decentralization," according to Mr. Borsodi, "is that method of implementing human aspirations in which individuals satisfy their wants as far as possible through personal action (including that of the family) and rely as little as possible upon group action and institutions for their satisfaction." It puts personality development and human values foremost; places the individual person above any institution, and regards his need for and opportunity to choose—and to *act* in accord with *his own* best thinking and choosing—as primary to respect for personality.

Decentralist research at The School of Living, and in the government Temporary National Economic Committee,⁴ shows the fallacy in the economic efficiency of bigness. Mr. Borsodi's experiments and cost studies prove that the cost of food and clothing and of some items of shelter is much less when produced at home than when purchased through the factory system.

The writer's seven years of home production in the decentralist pattern confirms this also. I can produce a pound loaf of whole-wheat bread at home for a total cost of four and a half cents (using the "average" costs before prices were seriously inflated). On a sturdy but inexpensive electric kitchen mill we grind our own wheat into fine whole flour; the bread is kneaded on an electric kitchen mixer and baked in an electric oven; so that the actual time and labor I put in is the ten minutes spent in assembling materials and washing equipment. For a similar product from the bakery I would need ten or eleven cents. Our cost records include charges for overhead, interest, and depreciation on equipment, for electricity, etc. The savings on electrically churned butter, canned food from our garden, clothing woven and sewed at home, are similarly surprising. Produced at home, our products are entirely without advertising, selling, and transportation expense, so necessary to the mass-

⁴ Published in *Big Business, Efficiency and Fascism*, by Kemper Simpson, Harper & Brothers, 1942.

produced, purchased items. Quality and nutrition are superior, and the creative activity of producing them is mentally, physically, and morally beneficial.

The evidence collected by the National Resources Committee for presentation to the Temporary National Economic Committee related to the efficiency of large, medium-sized, and small business. It studied hundreds of businesses plant by plant as to factory costs, corporate earnings, and real wages to labor. This material as analyzed by Kemper Simpson for the Federal Trade Commission and published in his book, *Big Business, Efficiency and Fascism*, shows that on none of these three counts are the largest corporations most efficient.

It may be asked then, "Why do these large corporations and mergers continue to exist, if they are less efficient than the middle-sized and smaller units?" He answers that great size and financial power has made it possible for the large units successfully to restrict, artificially, the growth and emergence of competitors. Their bigness has now given them the advantage of monopoly and the ability to pass the cost of inefficiency on to the consumer. The studies of Mr. Borsodi and Mr. Simpson and the daily record of hundreds of small and local producers the country over are exploding the big-business-efficiency myth.

Consequently, Decentralists head the list of their claims and activities with the decentralization of production. Moreover, electricity and fluid power facilitate it. The factory system was centralized early in one spot because of steam power. Power to run wheels and turbines and belts had to come from a stationary steam boiler. Now the source of power can be distributed anywhere. So it is possible to do in small shops and many places what once needed to be done in a big center. Some heavy industry will always need to be done in factories of some size, but can in most cases be now moved to the country, so that workers can be more dispersed, living on small homesteads. All this aids the fundamental tenets of Decentralization that widespread ownership of productive property is necessary to stable family life; that business and industry must be local to revive the neighborhood and small community; that people must be largely self-employed to become a nation of independent thinkers able to sustain democracy and freedom.

As to that central issue in modern life, the increase of totalitarianism and regimentation by so-called democratic governments, decentralists take a very definite stand. They see "government" as based on compulsion. The government is the only institution to which people grant the power

of coercion (i.e., police and armies). Decentralists hold that reliance on compulsory institutionalization (government) should be reduced to the utmost extent. But they are realistic in saying that the increase of government logically follows the increase of centralized industry, and of monopoly in finance and natural resources. They are therefore working at the root, to reduce and decentralize big business, and to eradicate the fundamental monopolies in land and finance.

For realizing its aims, decentralization relies on education, and on the taking of steps, family by family and community by community. It gives preference to the use of influence over that of power. It recognizes the place of leadership, but recognizes no right of economic or political leaders to coerce the individual where another alternative is possible. It holds that most of the so-called necessary centralizations of today will fall away when we properly relate human beings to natural resources and the community, and when we adapt modern technology primarily to the home and local shops instead of the large factory.

WHO ARE THE DECENTRALISTS AND WHAT ARE THEY DOING?

It is obvious that the general aims of decentralization—human freedom, creative living, self-sustained family life, revitalized communities, decreased government control, small business, etc.—will include a great many and varied groups in its ranks. That certainly is the case. The word “decentralization” is still somewhat new, and as a self-conscious movement it is still quite small. Thus it happens that many groups “belong” in this fold who may not have definitely allied themselves with it.

Probably the most openly avowed decentralists are the modern homesteaders, that growing group of productive homemakers that have resulted from Mr. Borsodi's early efforts and his writings along this line. Judging from the correspondence at The School of Living over the years and from the sale of their Productive-Home Bulletins, this is no small group. A notable example of this kind is the homestead of Mr. and Mrs. Ed Robinson of Noroton, Conn., and the far-famed “Have-More” Plan which they have developed as a result.

The reading of Mr. Borsodi's *Flight from the City* encouraged them to leave their New York City apartment in 1941 and adventure on a two-acre homestead fifty miles out. Here they, too, found the savings, the thrill and the satisfaction of building a house, producing their food, and raising a family in the country. In 1944 they told their story as a foreword to a catalog of books which they had found helpful, and pub-

lished it under the name of *The Have-More Plan*. Immediately it became popular, and in that year alone 35,000 copies were sold. By mid-1947 over 300,000 had been sold, and the sale of books instructing in homesteading activities was employing twenty people in a cottage-type building at Noroton. They report that one tenth of their customers have written to say that the plan helped them in buying and setting up homesteads.

Census reports from the U. S. Department of Agriculture testify also to this growing trend. Among their statistics we find:

	1930	1945
All classified farms.....	5,999,882	5,752,908
Farms producing primarily for own household use.....	498,019	1,289,206

This means that the small self-sustaining homestead has increased 250 per cent in fifteen years. While only one twelfth of all farms in 1930 were the productive homesteads, in 1945 they had grown to one fifth of the total farms. A "farm," according to the census definition, must have three acres or more of land or produce products valued at \$250 or more. Thus, the above figures do not show the corresponding increase for the same period which probably took place in the number of productive homesteads of less than three acres or which produced less than \$250 worth of products. If the number of such homesteads equals the number of "farms" producing primarily for their own household use, then there are probably 2,500,000 homesteads in the United States today. Owners of many of these may not know the word "decentralization," but they are part of the trend.

Milton and Florence Wend, in their homestead and "Productive-Home Research Association" at North Sandwich, N. H., are another positive force in this direction. Mr. Wend's book, *How to Live in the Country Without Farming*, shows families hundreds of ways to produce a cash income on a small acreage, to add to the fundamental sustenance which a few acres will produce.

A second large group of decentralists are those providing leadership for the restoration of the small communities of the land. Dr. Arthur E. Morgan, former president of Antioch College and head of T.V.A., has developed "Community Service, Inc." at Yellow Springs, Ohio. Since 1941 Community Service has supplied, through a staff of several people, literature, counseling, and speakers to guide small communities in their effort at self-improvement. They have also held a week-long Com-

munity Institute each summer at Yellow Springs for the study of small-community problems. Mr. Morgan's books, *The Small Community* and *A Business of My Own*, have been factors in this new education.

A somewhat similar effort has been going on for a number of years by the Extension Department of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, N. C. They have published a very helpful series of pamphlets describing successful community activities in the South. This Dominion Series has recently been published as a book, entitled *Communities In Action*, by Jess and Jean Ogden.

The School of Living has engineered a number of "intentional" communities: people who have associated to purchase a plot of land co-operatively and to develop and build small homesteads on it. Bayard Lane Community near Suffern, N. Y., and Van Houten Fields, West Nyack, N. Y., are results of this effort. The new types of land tenure, of co-operative finance and labor programs involved in these efforts is described in Bulletin No. 896, "Nonprofit Housing Projects," from the U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. Bryn Gweled Homestead Association, eighteen miles north of Philadelphia, near Feasterville, Pa., is a direct outgrowth of this pattern; and near Detroit, Chicago, Cincinnati, Dayton (Ohio), and Melbourne (Fla.), many others are similar in design.

Montana University, under the direction of a decentralist leader, Dr. Baker Brownell, has conducted a very careful survey of the regional, economic, social, and cultural problems that underlie the life in the small communities of the state, with a view to helping the people enrich and stabilize their culture. A series of study outlines has been published as *The Montana Study*.

These and similar efforts in other places have brought a flood of literature, institutes, and forums that is bringing the problem of the small community once more to the attention of the American public.

Another strong emphasis toward a renewal of a rural culture is that of the Rural Departments of the various church denominations. Among the Protestants it is led by the Town and Country Department of the Federal Council of Churches. There is hardly a denomination, however, but has its own rural section which holds conferences, disseminates literature, and encourages people to stay on the farm and to move there from the cities. One of the most effective is the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, of which Monsignor L. G. Ligutti is executive secretary. The Farm Bureau, the Grange, and the Farmers' Union are

in this class also, which support rural values but may not frequently use the term "decentralization."

The co-operatives bear a similar relation to the decentralist movement. On the whole, the co-operative is a factor in building community life and in helping the common man to own and manage his own business. The National Federation of Small Business Men likewise is working for this type of independence and decentralized control, though there may be at times some difference of emphasis between these two groups.

A very definite emphasis associated with decentralist thinking and acting is the conservation of the soil and natural resources. The serious soil depletion and erosion that now concerns a hungry world can be said to be largely the result of making agriculture a business, of overcropping or "mining" the soil, practices associated with commercialized and specialized farming. Such a pattern of soil-use is a direct corollary of an urban and industrialized world.

While many land-grant colleges and government agencies are fostering soil building and conservation, there are several forward-looking volunteer groups in this field which more properly align themselves as decentralist. One is the Friends of the Land, with national headquarters at 1368 N. High Street, Columbus, Ohio, and their quarterly journal, edited by Russel Lord at Bel Air, Md. Strong decentralist voices in this group are Louis Bromfield with his many rural books, and Elmer T. Peterson, editor of the *Daily Oklahoman*, author of *Forward to the Land*, and editor of the widely read book, *Cities Are Abnormal*, a compilation from twelve distinguished Americans.

One new branch of the soil conservationists consists of the periodicals and agencies which stress the organic way of farming—the following of natural methods; the diversified, small farm and the use of composted organic waste rather than chemical fertilizers. Among these are *Organic Gardening Magazine*, Emmaus, Pa., and such books as *An Agricultural Testament*, by Sir Albert Howard of England. Allied with this is the new trend in soil tillage represented by Edward Faulkner's book, *Plowman's Folly*.

Logically enough, another aspect of decentralist thought is the attention given to "organic" health; i.e., health which comes through a regimen of good living—outdoor work, whole foods (instead of devitalized and factory-processed foods), and healthy soil in which to raise food. Two groups heading this part of the movement are The American Academy of Applied Nutrition (Los Angeles), a group of doctors and dentists

organized to make such nutrition and soil study an integral part of medicine and dentistry; and The Lee Foundation for Nutritional Research in Milwaukee, with their findings and literature on the relation of soil and food to human health.

LAND TENURE AND MONEY REFORM

While activities suggested up to this point cut across much of the pattern of life termed "modern," most readers will agree to their desirability. But since the disease in society is so severe, many decentralists feel that the cure must go even deeper.

There yet remain two institutions in modern life so wrongly administered as to block any really widespread or effective decentralization of the whole culture. They are the institutions of land tenure, and money and credit. Land is the fundamental necessity to all life and to every economic activity. Money is essential to any but a primitive standard of living. Both land and money are now subject to entrenched monopoly which can nullify the efforts of all other decentralist activities. However strongly decentralists work to reshape the factory system or to foster the productive home and small community life, unless the centralized control of land and money be erased, decentralization of the whole cannot proceed very far. Ownership of small farms and businesses can be undertaken by a great many, only to be lost through manipulated inflation and deflation of our unscientific currency system. And the very success of soil conservation and co-operatives only raises the value of land, which value—under our present unethical system—makes it difficult for people to get to the land, and goes (through higher land price or land rent) into the pockets of individual land "owners" who did not labor to produce this increase. Consequently many decentralists are looking to reforms in land and money as a definite part of their program and contribution to a better, more human society.

As to land, many decentralists, though not all, favor the analysis of Henry George, who pointed out the nature and cause of unearned increment in land. He showed that the "rent of land" is due to the group or community activities going on around it; and that therefore, the rent or price of land is payment for the social advantages—i.e., access to schools, markets, roads, etc.—at that site. To have title to land in the users' hands but to set aside this site-rent fund (not including rent of buildings) for public use, and leave all buildings and labor products for private or co-operative use, would do more to eliminate the barrier of speculation

and monopoly in land than any other thing. Decentralists would not turn this site-rent fund over to the federal or centralized government, but have it administered by local communities. They make clear that this is a third alternative to communist and capitalist administration of capital (i.e., labor products) and land. Communism treats both land and capital as "government" property, while capitalism treats both land and capital as private property. The former results in the monopoly of the state, and the latter results in private monopoly. Both thwart and restrict the economic freedom of the average person. The administration of land and labor products demanded by their true nature, is to let the "rent of land"—not the land itself—be administered by the community group, the while each individual retains what his labor produces in tangible goods or capital. The network of adult schools chartered by the Regents of the state of New York, known as The Henry George Schools of Social Science, and several journals, notably *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 50 E. 69th Street, New York City, are leading in education in the fundamental economics underlying this land-value aspect of decentralization.

As to money, there is as yet no official decentralist position, but their general formulations insist that money should not be the creation of the state nor subject to political regulation. The function of money is to facilitate trade; it should come into existence when goods need to be sold and withdrawn when the sale is completed. That is, people's co-operative banks could issue currency against goods in warehouses, and the currency be destroyed when the transaction is finished. Thus would currency in circulation always bear a definite and close relation to goods in existence, and so eliminate inflation and deflation. Many money-reform groups are working on this problem, but few of them suggest the removal of money from government regulation. The Valun Institute for Monetary Research, 226 E. 26th Street, New York City, is one such. The reform of Silvio Gesell is another approach to money reform, and is associated with a land reform.

These are but the main streams of thought and activity which make up the American decentralist movement. The teaching and publications of The School of Living, Suffern, N. Y., under Mr. Borsodi's direction, covers and includes them all. The present work of Mr. Borsodi is one of synthesis and integration. In his new book, *Education and Living*, he has defined the thirteen major problems of living and marshaled all the solutions which will restore the family, revitalize the small community,

help individuals satisfy their wants with as little reliance as possible upon institutions, and so issue in normal living—that living which allows the fullest use of all human capacities at every period in the life cycle.

The Decentralist Conference, with executive headquarters at Parsons College, Fairfield, Iowa, is another point of integration of the groups and ideas which comprise the movement. Four national meetings have been held since it was initiated by *The Interpreter*, decentralist semimonthly, in 1945. Persons from these various agencies have gathered to learn from one another, to define better their common aims, to broaden and perfect their techniques, to construct a united front for advancing the practices that will improve democracy and extend human freedom.

Decentralists believe that means determine ends. Their desired ends are creative, responsible, free men and women in normal families. This requires land and buildings and shops, with the determining majority of people working for themselves. Decentralists believe that the fight for freedom is ultimately quite meaningless unless it is carried right down to those fundamental units, the family and the individual man, because it is for these that the higher units of government and industry exist—and not the other way around, as both fascist and communist doctrines hold. What the common man needs is not to be cared for by an employer or the state, but to be given the opportunity to care for himself. That is the decentralist plan and program. For only thus can man become what he was meant to be—a free, creative, responsible person, rather than merely a molecule of society.

Protestant Union and Denominational Loyalty

HERBERT C. ALLEMAN

The roots of Protestantism are in individual regeneration—modern democracy stems from the Reformation—no union may discount these facts.

I

WOULD IT BE a good thing for the Church of Christ in America if all the Protestant denominations were merged into some form of external union?

The tide is running—or rather eddying—in that direction. Six denominations have asked their brethren “to participate in the plenary conference to consider the immediate possibilities of closer unity.” Others have expressed their sympathy with the general idea, some of them having appointed committees to study and report on it to their ruling bodies. With that objective, at least in principle, divided Protestantism must sympathize. It is popular. Unionism is our *zeitgeist*. Combination is the order of the day in economics, in politics, in statecraft.

Two are better than one
For worship or for war.

One world is the goal of our generation.

Were “one church” the supreme need of Christendom today, with a single voice, speaking for all the faithful, we have it at hand, with the historic continuity of twenty centuries. All that divided Protestantism needs to do is to retrace its steps to the point of departure from Mother Church. Each visible church as a single organ of instruction is a desideratum secondary to the faithful testimony of all its members. The unity of the church is in its Head, under whom there are many members and many forms of testimony. The Church is not a totem pole to be bowed before in silent submission. Rather it is like a tree of many branches, the life of whose central trunk throbs in the remotest leaf. Christian faith is not a shibboleth but a fellowship whose voice is the testimony of the inner life. Back of all testimony is the conviction of truth.

Of course, there will be differences in the apprehension of truth which is conserved in words. Testimony is rooted in the conviction that

the evidence has been read aright. Such conviction is not to be confused with bigotry. Bigotry is religious zeal run mad; conviction is a deliberate judgment. "The bigot," says Oliver Wendell Holmes, "is like the pupil of the eye; the more light you pour on it, the more it contracts." Bigotry is the defense mechanism of ignorance. The true Protestant stakes all upon his interpretation of Christian truth, but by the very intensity of his conviction he makes room for the interpretation of other Christians whose eye may have caught the light from another facet of the precious gem of truth. For example, if to be a Lutheran causes me to lay emphasis upon the doctrine of justification by faith as the chief article of the Christian faith, then there is nothing narrow or sectarian in my insistence upon it as a condition of fellowship in the Christian family. As Dr. Wheeler Robinson said to his students in Regent Park College (Oxford), "The true Catholic is not he who reduces his religion to the greatest common measure of all the types, but he who so faithfully and so charitably maintains his own convictions that they bring him out at last into the larger fellowship of the one holy and apostolic Church."¹

In this respect religion is like patriotism. The Attic Philosopher muses:

What is your country? It is all that surrounds you, all that has brought you up and fed you, all that you have loved! The ground that you see, these houses, these trees, those girls that go along there laughing—this is your country! The laws which protect you, the bread which pays for your work, the words you interchange with others, the joy and grief which come to you from the men and things among which you live—this is your country! The little room where you used to see your mother, the remembrances she has left you, the earth where she rests—this is your country! You see it, you breathe it, everywhere.²

Patriotism begins just there. It is the most provincial thing in life. One's country, for which it is "sweet and beautiful to die," is, next to one's religion, the most personal of our human interests.

Breathes there a man with soul so dead
Who never to himself hath said,
This is my own, my native land?

It is to protect and defend this priceless treasure that men have gone forth in arms, "not to kill but to be killed," rather than have their fellows lose it. The horizons of patriotism widen with the years; but it begins there.

Our religion is like that. It begins in the individual experience of fellowship with God, when, like John Wesley's, our hearts were "strangely

¹ Henry Wheeler Robinson: *A Memoir*, by Ernest A. Payne. London, 1946, p. 160.

² An Attic Philosopher in Paris, by Emile Souvestre. D. Appleton & Co., New York, 1894.

warmed" by the proclamation of divine Grace. It grows by the germination of faith thus kindled. And that growing faith will have its landmarks—the Bible school in which we learned the elements of the Christian revelation, the church in which we were confirmed, in which, it may be, we entered into "the holy estate of matrimony," in which our children were baptized, from which we followed to the grave the precious dust of loved ones, and from which we ourselves shall follow in the long procession of the dead. It expands in the warm fellowship of the Christian congregation, in the widening horizon of the church's mission, in the projects of the Christian community, in the goodly company of fellow crusaders against unrighteousness in high places, and—if it be our good fortune—in world conferences of Christian leaders, when, to use the figure of Wheeler Robinson, we seem to see the hand of God grasping the heavenly compasses and sweeping out a new horizon which includes all mankind. No man can be a narrow denominationalist with the seventh chapter of Revelation before his eyes. But that enthralling experience is rooted in the covenant soil of our personal regeneration. Unless our religion is fanaticism or bigotry we shall come to cherish fellowship with all God's children who have had experience similar to our own and who share our faith. Organic mergers of Protestant divisions, if they are to endure, must be inductive and not deductive. It is not enough to quote our Lord's words about the unity of believers and then issue a call for the merger of all the divisions of the church as we know it. Such uprooting would yield only ecclesiastical chaos. Federation, but not a superimposed union, is all that is indicated in a democracy like ours in which, after the experience of a century and a half, we still see the wisdom of preserving the states as essential elements of the nation.

II

It is not to be denied that the health chart of Protestantism is not satisfactory. Dr. Charles Clayton Morrison in *The Christian Century*, speaking frankly of the ills of Protestantism,³ rendered American Protestantism a valuable service. His diagnosis cannot be gainsaid. The ills are there. To begin with, we believe that Protestantism is suffering from a general secularitis. *Secularis* means "of the present age" or "worldly." Protestantism released the state from the thraldom of the church, gave the Western world free enterprise, and unwittingly became the mother

³ "Protestantism, thou ailest here and here," May 22, 1946.

of modern economic prosperity and capitalism. The new prosperity changed the entire outlook on life throughout the Western world. The recovered "universal priesthood of believers" set a premium on the individual, which in turn stimulated industry and the search for new fields of enterprise. Religion came out from the monastery and took up the normal activities of a free society. Did not society at its best reveal more of true religion than the mummary of the cloister? Would not material welfare satisfy more hearts than otherworldliness?

And so, little by little, the emphasis has shifted from the future to the present, until it has come to pass that "heaven" has almost disappeared from our vocabulary, and social welfare and security, here, now, have become more important than a title to mansions in the sky.

Secularism, by its emphasis on technology and physical welfare, has laid a heavy mortgage on the church. Jesus Christ created the church by preaching the gospel of the Kingdom of God. He called men to a new life, a God-centered life. The church is not just another fraternal society, with its rules and benefits. It is not even merely an ethical-culture society. It is the fellowship of those who hear and accept the gospel of God's Grace. The New Testament word for church means "the called." It is a "calling," the call to come out from the world into the fellowship of Jesus Christ. The church is the chief witness in the world that there is a better way than the way of power domination and material remedies. The church is not a homeopathic institution. It does not believe that "like cures like."

One of the ills of Protestantism is that it has forgotten that it is not called to bear witness in the world on the world's terms. Like Israel of old we have asked for gods that men can see, and our Aarons have been only too quick to respond with a "Bring your gold." What towering temples we have reared for the worship of him whose auditorium was a hillside and his pulpit a fishing boat; what paraments and paraphernalia to proclaim his gospel whose surplice was a peasant's robe and his only insignia the cross on which he died! We might almost say of the church as it has come to be operated, what a great statesman has said of modern government, "It is an expensive luxury."

If at this point it be objected, "Should not our Lord have the best?" it is but fair to reply, "What best?" What is to be the standard? While Aaron was busy fashioning the golden calf, Moses was in the mount in communion with him whose Torah was to be the pattern of Israel's life. The golden calf was *their* best, but it was not good enough. Their technology had outrun their religion, and so has ours. If one were to analyze

the budgets of the church of today (we are still speaking of Protestantism) we should see that her strength is spent on what St. John describes as "the things that our physical nature and our eyes crave, the proud display of life" (Goodspeed). One might think that St. James had become the patron saint of Protestantism instead of St. John—"I will show thee my faith by my works."

Take a look at the average Protestant congregation. Its joy and its pride in the edifice in which it assembles. Its worship is a "program," the parts of which are appraised for their artistic effect, with the aid of regulated lightings. The bulletin is a schedule of activities. The minister's room is an "office." The parish house is the center of interest, and the congregational dinner is the highest festival of the year. Money flows freely for social entertainment, usually camouflaged with the adjective "service." We follow the minister to his synod, and we find more time devoted to the discussion of the minimum salary and the ministerial pension than to the missionary work of the church. We follow the minister into the pulpit—but let more competent witnesses speak here. Said Bishop Berry recently, speaking of the English pulpit: "The radical weakness of preaching today is its triviality. It has forgotten how to speak the Great Language. The sermon today is too easily degraded into clever remarks about social welfare. . . . This is not preaching as we inherited it." And Henry J. Luce, in his address to the Protestant clergy of Chicago:

The world is in a great quest for truth. Have you got the truth? If not, keep silent. If you have the truth—with all due acknowledgment of sin and finitude—then tell us what it is; as earnestly, as clearly as you can. We, in the church or out of it, will not be bored. We are thirsty for the truth! But we will be bored by the stale moralities or inept attempts to comment on current events. Do you know about God? That is what we, in the church or out of it, want to know.⁴

That is a veiled but withering indictment. It is encouraging to be assured that the Protestant pulpit is returning to biblical preaching. Perhaps the lead has come from the pew; apparently it will be welcome there.

But the pew is not free from indictment. If the messages to the seven churches of Asia Minor represent seven phases of the changing church, then our "pew" must be in the church of Laodicea, the church of the *nouveau riche*: "Rich, and increased with goods, and needing nothing." Laodicea under Roman rule had risen from an insignificant village to the first place in Phrygia. It had prospered, and the church at Loadicea was enjoying the new prosperity. They were "at ease in Zion," to use

⁴ *The Christian Century*, Mar. 19, 1947, pp. 362-365.

Amos' phrase. Amos says there were great club habitués at Samaria in the heyday of their prosperity. The men lolled on couches of ivory, and ate the lambs of the flock and the fatlings of the stall, and drank wine by the bowlful, and anointed themselves with the finest of cosmetics; while the ladies, whom he calls "cows of Bashan," emulated their husbands whom they commanded to "bring (provide) that we may drink." The finery of the ladies of Zion in Jerusalem is catalogued by Isaiah in 3:16. Our drink bill in the United States has increased enormously since social drinking has become a common practice: over eight billions last year, while we spent something like four billions for cosmetics and jewelry—and not a tenth of that for education, religion, and philanthropy. In religion we are "neither cold nor hot"; we make token payments to the church, but like "the men of mark" in the church at Samaria we are "not heartsick over the ruin of Joseph."

At Laodicea, says Ramsay, they made a famous specific for weakness of the eyes. The Lord of the church at Laodicea exhorts it to "anoint thine eyes with eyesalve that thou mayest see." "Where there is no vision the people fall away." Our easy indulgences are narcotics that dull the soul. Protestantism in America as of this year of our Lord is not worthy of spiritual world-leadership. "I counsel thee . . . be zealous, therefore, and repent."

III

Protestantism has been very sensitive to the age-spirit, and in our times has suffered from secularitis, not only in her grosser materialism but also in her methodology; she has dressed in prevailing fashions and adopted the nostrums of the new-science soul-doctors. But she is essentially sound, and she will recover. For one thing, she is a democracy in a democracy. A democratic state cannot resign itself to a hierarchical church. The key doctrine of democracy is the inherent worth of the individual. The essential dignity of the individual persists in America. We imbibed it in what we may call "our mother's milk" as a nation. The first lisping words we learned to say are "All men are created equal." That cornerstone of our national faith is the gift to America of Protestantism, as Protestantism in turn is the flower of primitive Christianity. People here are seen as our Lord saw them, people as souls, not as mere types or functions.

This is reflected in our jury system, in which a man under indictment is tried before a jury of *his peers*, and every citizen of sound mind is

eligible for such service. The reason why communism is hateful to the American mind is that it lumps humanity in the mass. It is this religious character of American values which explains the failure of communism to make much impression upon the ranks of labor. The gospel of labor is the dignity of the individual man—to the last man among them. It is the fundamental importance of those individual values that makes us offer such stubborn resistance to any theory which sets only economic value on a man.

This high conception of the worth of a man—not to the state, but to the man himself—is the heart of democracy. And therefore any decay of religious belief is dangerous for democracy. If we are the children of God, have immortal souls and an eternal destiny, then we are real people. "It is impossible to believe," says J. B. Priestley, "that men have immortal souls, and at the same time see people as 'masses.' Behind the conception of 'the masses' is a complete disbelief in immortality, the soul, spirit, deity. And *murder* becomes *liquidation*. . . . For the past fifty years this dignity has been dive-bombed."⁵ We recall how helpless Christian people in Germany sacrificed their faith on the altar of national power; and, on the other hand, how in the stress and strain of both World Wars distracted mothers and wives, like the people of Judah in the days of Isaiah, went to consult soothsayers; and how now in the confusion of reconstruction the bewildered betake themselves to psychic specialists and mental restcures—"they take counsel, but not of me, saith the Lord." It is the curse of the totalitarian ideology that it dwarfs and blights the individual man.

Protestantism was born in the recovery of the individual. When Luther came out of the cloister and proclaimed "the universal priesthood of believers" a new era of society was ushered in. All Western Europe heard that voice. It took wings and heartened the burgher of the Netherlands and sent the Dutch colonists to the Hudson; it lifted the shadow of Rome from Scandinavia, and sent the Swedes to the Delawares; it deepened the English Channel and recruited Cromwell's Roundheads and the Westminster dissenters; it rigged the "Mayflower" and piloted the Pilgrims to Plymouth Rock; it gave Wesley and Whitfield tongues of fire, and sent the Methodists to Georgia and the Middle Colonies; it lighted on the desk of a Swiss schoolmaster, and sent his little book to the City of Brotherly Love. If one goes to the Philadelphia Library and asks for "No. 77" he may take in his hands the well-worn copy of Burlamaqui's

⁵ *Out of the People*, Harper & Brothers, 1941.

The Principles of Natural Law, which delegates to the Continental Congress are said to have read more than any other treatise while they were hammering out on the anvil of liberty the Declaration of Independence. It was the political application of the principle of "the universal priesthood of believers." No one has a natural, inherent right to exercise authority; rulership is the service of all the people of the state; the people alone have inherent and inalienable rights. "Natural society is a state of equality and liberty . . . and an entire independence of any other power except God."

These are the elements which entered into the making of America. Protestantism, whose strength has been democratic diversity, is the sum of them. The matter of merging the denominations of Protestantism should be studied in the light of their origins. All of our much-maligned hundreds of denominations stand for a conviction of an inalienable right and the local application of that right. Each had its origin in a vision of truth, and each has its landmarks. It is difficult, if not perilous, to attempt to merge denominations. If there is loyalty to the Head of the Church, there should be room for many members. A church is not like a factory. We can merge factories without loss, usually with gain, for their product is inanimate consumers' goods. But a church is like a tree; we do not merge trees.

Protestantism is on the right road to her largest service in a Federal Council of the Churches of Christ. Such a Council will counsel the healing of family divisions, the apportionment of fields of service, the union of forces in the face of common foes—but that will be a volunteer, not a conscripted army. What our several church bodies need is not a superimposed union with other discouraged bodies but a fresh baptism of the fire of their founders. The lines used for the Pilgrim Tercentenary might well be translated into a slogan for every denomination:

O ye who boast
In your free veins the blood of sires like these,
Lose not their lineaments. Should Mammon cling
Too close around your heart,—or wealth beget
That bloated luxury that eats the core
From manly virtue,—or the tempting world
Make faint the Christian purpose in your soul,—
Kneel in their footprints and renew the vow
They breathed to God.⁶

⁶ Quoted in the preface to *New England Memorial*, by Nathaniel Morton, Boston, 1855.

The Living Word

JOHN PATERSON

"The Book that is Alive" cannot properly be understood by dissection and analysis; the organic unity of the Old Testament and New must be re-emphasized.

THE RECENT COMMOTION in this country regarding the return to these shores of a famous Scandinavian singer recalls the story of another famous songstress from the same region. About the middle of the last century there was none better known than Jenny Lind, "the Swedish nightingale." She possessed a voice of rare brilliance and sympathetic quality with a compass from D to D in alt, and her appearance in opera and on the concert platform created scenes of extraordinary enthusiasm. She was sweet as her voice and pure as her song. She was a public sensation and her name was on every tongue. But at the height of her career in 1870 she suddenly retired from her work. None could understand her action and the world wondered. One day a reporter called at her home and put the oft-repeated question, Why did you retire from the theater when the world was at your feet? She was sitting by an open window with a Bible on her knee and gazing out toward the setting sun. To the reporter's question she quietly replied, "When every day it made me think less and less of this"—and she laid her hand on the Bible—"and nothing at all of that"—and she pointed to the glowing sunset—"what else could I do?" The great singer knew the "things by which men live, and wholly therein is the life of the spirit."

It is worth asking what is this Bible by which Jenny Lind seemed to set such store and for which she deemed it wise to surrender so much.

VARIED AS LIFE ITSELF

It may help us here if we recall a word of J. R. Green in his *Short History of the English People*. In dealing with the Puritan period he remarks: "England became the people of one book and that book was the Bible." Plato has told us that the state is but the individual writ large; and in this instance, as in the individual case just cited, we perceive something of the vitality of the Bible. For out of England came both the Puritans and the Pilgrim Fathers, and that period was not the least glorious in world history. A little more than fifty years ago that one book could be found on the table in the living room of most homes

in Britain and in this country. It is not there now; the Sears-Roebuck catalog has displaced it and Walter Winchell and Drew Pearson have become our national oracles. In that change something precious has died in the national soul and we are strangely impoverished. It is significant that a recent Parliamentary committee in Britain reported thus: "As the practice of reading the Bible, regularly and religiously, at home has decreased, by so much has the nation deliberately impoverished itself."

But let us return to Green's word: "one book." The Bible is not one book: it is a library of books, a divine library. This library consists of sixty-six separate books, thirty-nine being in the Old Testament and twenty-seven in the New Testament. Here are books by different authors, known and unknown, books of varying literary quality and widely divergent spiritual value, books written through the changing historical backgrounds of a thousand years and more. Law and Prophecy are here and the "Writings," too, with their miscellaneous content. We hear again the thunder's roll and mark the lightning's flash as that Law is given at Sinai and a motley crowd of desert nomads is welded and fused into a people of God in the glow of an incandescent faith. We hear the "sound of running history" and mark the footsteps of Almighty God as he makes broad his path in the life of Israel. We see history becoming the channel of divine revelation. The moving panorama takes shape before our eyes. The triumph song of Miriam by the Sea of Reeds and the battle chant of Deborah by Megiddo are here; and here, too, are the melodies of Israel's sweet singers as they break into exultation over the mighty deliverances wrought by God for them or rise from the depths when his people bow before the chastening rod of his judgments. The *Hallelujah Chorus* sounds high above the *Miserere*, for the Hebrew did not often sing in the minor mode. The seraphic eloquence of Isaiah falls upon our ears and the passionate pleadings of Jeremiah grip and stir our hearts while the seers tell of far-off things yet to be. Here we learn of kingdoms that shall arise and of dominions that know no end. Those inspired men dream dreams and think long, long thoughts: they "behold the King in his beauty and see the land of far distances." They live in the face of vast horizons. Ancient sages with their "wise saws" counsel the wayward children of men and direct them in the solemn business of living. Here, too, are the deeper utterances of the human spirit in the day of trial when the billows pass over their heads and men seek to solve the riddle of the universe and see again the face of God. Often we hear them in the bleak, black hour

of the spirit as they cry, "My God, my God, why?" or, impatient of the divine delays, they ask, "How long, O Lord, how long?" Gospels full of tender benedictions and Epistles filled with spacious arguments and Apocalypses that spill the vials of wrath—these are all here.

What a variety is here! What a book is the Bible! Simple stories from the morning of life when the earth was young and the sons of God shouted for very joy in the creating energy of God, slices from life and transcripts from experience that tell of man's upward struggle to the fuller light, honest books that reveal man as he really is, man in his virtues and his vices, in his joys and in his sorrows, in his defeats and victories. Here we have a book that in its mood of pessimism denies all meaning to life and says it is all a bubble, a big bubble (*Ecclesiastes*), and here again is another book (*Esther*) that never mentions the name of God but finds its chief joy in describing a pogrom in reverse—which fortunately has no basis in history. This is not what we would expect in a "Holy Bible, book divine," but it has pleased God to give us such a book.

UNITY THROUGH VARIETY

For we must now speak of it as "one book" and we will rightly call it *the Book*. For through all this strange variety there runs a deep, underlying unity: one increasing purpose is in it all. It is this unity of purpose that constrains us to speak of the Bible as "the book." For a scarlet thread of divine purpose runs from Genesis to Revelation and binds all the books into one. The Bible is thus the record of God's redemptive activity from beginning to end. One or two illustrations will make this clear, and we may begin here right at the beginning. In the second and third chapters of Genesis we have the story of the Garden of Eden, and at the very end of the Book of Revelation we have the story of the garden city of God.

And he showed me a pure river of water of life, clear as a crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb. In the midst of the street of it and on either side of the river was there the tree of life, which bare twelve manner of fruits, and yielded her fruit every month; and the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations.¹

We have read these words often enough, but it may be we have failed to grasp their real significance. Here we have *Paradise Regained* set over against *Paradise Lost*, and here we see how God makes retrieval and redemption. For if we enquire how man is to pass from *Paradise Lost* to *Paradise Regained*—and that is the problem for all the sons of

¹ Rev. 22:1, 2.

men—we must open our Bibles at the middle and there we read of a third garden, the Garden of Gethsemane, where “we have rest by his sorrow and life by his death.” Only as we have fellowship with him there will we have fellowship with him in the City of God. If we share the fellowship of his sufferings we shall share the fellowship of his glory. In that sense we might almost say the Bible is a gardener’s book or a book about gardens.

The kiss of the sun for pardon,
The song of the birds for mirth,
One is nearer God’s heart in a garden
Than anywhere else on earth.²

Nor need this be regarded as wholly fanciful. It can be attested by any attentive reader. Primitive man leads through regular sequence to man redeemed and glorified. Theologians may express it in another way and say, as the New Testament says, “The Lamb was slain from the foundation of the world.” Creation was laid and founded on a redemptive basis. The only-begotten Son was in the bosom of the Father from all eternity, and Calvary is but the bringing forth into time of a thought that was in the heart of God from eternity.

THE OLD TESTAMENT MAKES THE NEW TESTAMENT CLEAR

That the New Testament cannot be understood without the Old Testament is an elementary axiom in the interpretation of Scripture. The Old Testament is the record of a long search while the New Testament is the story of a great find. It is not without reason that the Protestant Reformers placed the prophets at the end of our Bible (Chronicles is the last book in the Hebrew Bible), for they stand like sentinels on watch, waiting “for him who is to come.” That is the typical attitude of the Old Testament saint, “waiting for the consolation of Israel.” It is the attitude of Daniel with his face pressed against the windowpane looking toward Jerusalem. They are on tiptoe with a tense spirit of expectation, for they live by faith.

My soul waiteth for the Lord
More than they that watch for morning.³

Behold, as the eyes of servants look unto the hand of their masters,
And as the eyes of a maiden unto the hand of her mistress,
So our eyes wait upon the Lord our God.⁴

² Dorothy Frances Gurney, “The Lord God Planted a Garden.” By permission from Burns, Oats & Washburne, Ltd., London.

³ Ps. 130:6.

⁴ Ps. 123:2.

It is this attitude of expectancy that characterizes the Old Testament and accounts for that forward look that expresses itself in messianic prophecy. It is based on a *lineal theory of history*, that sees events taking shape under the direction of a divine purpose to an ultimate goal. Such a theory of history is not found outside the Bible, and that is why we are justified in speaking of progressive revelation. *History here does not move in cycles or circular form*, passing through various ages—golden, silver, iron, clay—to end in cataclysm and then begin all over again.

Not that the Bible thinks of history as moving forward in a straight line but rather as a spiraling line, sometimes receding but always moving forward again on a higher level; the movement is forward and to a goal. History to the Hebrew was the sphere in which the divine purpose was unveiled. Thus the Old Testament finds its consummation in the New, and the New finds its explanation in the Old. To use the words of Augustine:

Novum Testamentum in Vetere latet;
 Vetus Testamentum in Novo patet.
 (In the Old Testament the New lies concealed;
 In the New Testament the Old is revealed).

Without the New Testament the Old Testament would be but a shapeless torso ending in the sterilities of the Talmud; without the Old Testament the New would be an inexplicable riddle. Each is incomplete without the other. Thus we find the same sentinel attitude in the case of Anna and Simeon (Luke 2) who stand at the end of the old and the beginning of the new dispensation. It has the sound of a great "At Last." Thus Simeon says, "Now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word; for mine eyes have seen thy salvation."⁵ Life has nothing more to offer to the man who has seen the salvation of the Lord.

We may demonstrate this from another side and say that the Old Testament represents religion in the interrogative mood while the New Testament represents it in its glorious affirmations. Thus again the vital connection is made clear. The Old Testament asks questions; the New Testament gives answers. The Old Testament mood is expressed in such cries as "How long, O Lord, how long?" or more poignantly by "My God, my God, why?" The New Testament shouts in the joy of great discovery, "Thanks be unto God through our Lord Jesus Christ." The Old Testament saint is:

⁵ Luke 2:29, 30.

An infant crying in the night,
An infant crying for the light,
And with no language but a cry.⁶

The New Testament saint stands in the fullness of light, and all the shadows are gone. The whole sacrificial system of the Old Testament, it would not be too much to say, is but a searching and groping after complete knowledge of and communion with God. In the New Testament the search is ended and men rejoice as they "who find great spoil." One of the most thrilling stories in the Old Testament is the story of Abraham and Isaac in Genesis. We may use it for illustration.

And it came to pass after these things that God did tempt (i.e., make trial of) Abraham. And he said, Take now thy son, thine own son, Isaac, whom thou lovest, and get thee into the land of Moriah; and offer him there for a burnt-offering. . . . And Abraham took the wood of the burnt-offering, and laid it upon Isaac his son; and he took the fire in his hand, and a knife; and they went both of them together. And Isaac spake unto his father, and said, My father: and he said, Here am I, my son. And he said, Behold the fire and the wood, but where is the lamb for a burnt-offering? ⁷

The Hebrew has a strange austerity of speech here, a wonderful economy of words, but every word is weighted full. Whether one reads the story in the original or in translation one cannot fail to be struck by the extreme passion and pathos of it all. The repeated emphasis, *thy son, thine only son, Isaac, whom thou lovest*, shows by its halting, limping form the dreadful thing that was laid upon the heart of Abraham. Not that the Hebrew lingers over emotion or makes play upon the feelings: Hollywood would have shown us something there! They could have made more of that story but in so doing they would assuredly have marred its immortal beauty. A whole vast ocean of grief is here, and the language trembles with emotion. The innocent prattle of the child must have sounded like "clods falling on coffins" to the father's breaking heart. The Hebrew says nothing of all that.

Though the story was first written for another purpose than the later editor had in view, it expresses for us the spirit of the Old Testament. "Where is the lamb?" is the cry of that volume, and it echoes all through the Old Testament and underlies all the zeal of the sacrificial system. It finds answer only when on that day John the Baptist is standing with two of his disciples and sees One approaching of whom

⁶ Tennyson, *In Memoriam*.

⁷ Gen. 22:1-7.

he can say, "Behold the Lamb."⁸ The agelong quest is ended: man's long search has reached a great discovery.

If we may use a domestic figure of speech we might say the Old Testament is full of buttonhooks (?), while the New Testament is full of hatpins (!). That is a picturesque way of saying that the Old Testament gives us religion in the interrogative mood while the New Testament gives it in the affirmative. In the New Testament, men are leaping and dancing and praising God, and all theology is fused into doxology. "Thanks be unto God." "Worthy is the Lamb!" "Behold what manner of love!" Well might Renan describe the New Testament as the most radiant hymnbook ever written. Men sing when they arrive for their joy is full. The Law, moreover, was our "schoolmaster to bring us to Christ," and men rejoiced because it had found its consummation. "The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy."⁹ For the Jew the Old Testament ran to seed in the finespun futilities of the Talmud, but for the Christian it blossomed into the gospel.

FALSE INTERPRETATIONS TO BE AVOIDED

We have laid such stress on this matter of inner unity and organic connection of the Old and New Testaments because, more frequently and wrongly, the unity is sought in another direction which destroys the real vitality of Scripture. By many the Old Testament is regarded as the New Testament in hieroglyphics, while allegorical interpretations and a theology of types read into the Old Testament ideas and doctrines that are foreign to the Hebrew and impossible to his way of thinking. Exegesis, which means *leading out* what is in the text, gives place to eisegesis which *leads into* the text things that are not there. The time has come for fair play toward the Bible. It must be allowed to speak for itself. The prophetic insight which enabled the prophets to see to the roots and realities of things and discern eternal principles in temporary and transient settings is changed too often into the far-sight of the stargazer who spoke of things that had no relevance to the people whom the speaker addressed. And so the Book of Daniel in the Old, and the Book of Revelation in the New Testament have become the happy hunting-grounds of fools and fanatics who fancy they see the number of the beast on the forehead of Hitler and identify the Kremlin at Moscow with the great image on the plain of Dura. Such extra-

⁸ John 1:29.

⁹ Rev. 19:10.

gances are to be regretted: they reduce the Bible to a volume of puzzles and turn it into a collection of ingenious conundrums.

"The letter killeth but the spirit giveth life."¹⁰ This cannot be emphasized too much or too often. It is worth while lingering over that word for a moment. An earlier age was accustomed to proving the truth of Christianity by pointing to the miracles in the Gospel stories and the prophecies of the Old Testament. He would be a bold man who would essay that line today, for conditions have changed entirely. People are not disposed to accept miracles readily, and it is the fashion to regard the prophets as characterized by insight rather than foresight or farsight. Such an antithesis as that just mentioned in regard to the prophets may not mean as much as is often thought; insight need not exclude foresight, and in the case of the prophets it did not. No one will deny that there is much prediction in Old Testament prophecy, but no one can deny that many of the predictions were not fulfilled. If the prophets were to be judged by their power to predict they would shrink considerably in stature. They were primarily spokesmen for God and they spoke to the people of their time in reference to the needs and demands of their time. Religion, says A. S. Peake,¹¹

is not, as used to be thought, a matter to be received on credentials, for, as Hort said, what do they prove but themselves? We have now taken the weight of our apologetic from the external and thrown it upon the intrinsic value. Unless the Gospel is true for its own sake argument from miracle or prophecy will do little nowadays to establish its credit. The temper of our times is too impatient of our proofs.

It is this "temper of our times" we have to meet. The divinity of Christ may not be proved by the miracles but *the miracles can be proved by the Person of Christ.*

Nor are the proof-texts of Matthew's Gospel—to adduce a particular instance of a common failing—any enhancement to the Person of our Lord. Matthew is the most Jewish of the Gospel writers and he reveals a leading characteristic of Judaism in his stress upon the letter. "That all righteousness might be fulfilled" or "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets"—these formulae recur with such frequency that one might almost think Jesus was living his life according to some external program. Nothing, however, could be further from the truth: Jesus was wholly free and spontaneous in all his actions, and there was nothing of the mechanical or formal in his life so that his

¹⁰ II Cor. 3:6.

¹¹ Peake, A. S., *The Bible, its Origin, Significance and Abiding Worth*. London, 1913, p. 362.

movements or words could be calculated in advance. The very use of such texts in Matthew shows the danger of the method. "Out of Egypt have I called my son"¹² is from Hosea and refers, without question, to Israel, while the reference is inappropriate, for the prophet goes on in that oracle to chide and rebuke the people for apostacy. In Matt. 2:23 we have a reference to an Old Testament oracle which is not found in the Old Testament at all, and in yet another case we have an oracle attributed to Jeremiah when it is actually from the prophet Zechariah.¹³ Too great stress may not be laid upon the letter; the glowing spirit is the vitality of Scripture.

While we are contending here that Jesus was far too vital and inspired to live according to a prepared program it is worthy of note that on particular occasions he did set himself deliberately in line with Old Testament prediction and fulfill it before the eyes of the people. Such an occasion was the triumphal entry into Jerusalem on Palm Sunday.¹⁴ Here he links himself with popular expectation and sets himself forth as the fulfillment of Old Testament prediction. *But he does this of his own initiative and not by external constraint.* Normally, however, it is otherwise. If he assumes the role of the Suffering Servant (Isa. 53) and if men assign that role to him no one can argue that literal fulfillment is involved here, for all that is said of the Suffering Servant cannot be interpreted in detail of Jesus. The church was guided by a sound instinct when it referred Isaiah 53 to the sufferings of Christ, but the identity is not of the letter but of the spirit. The great argument from prophecy, says Peake, "is that which views the whole history of Israel as moving steadily forward to its climax in the Gospel."¹⁵ That is the lineal theory of history. The prophets were dynamic men with nothing mechanical about them. To treat the Old Testament as a collection of proof-texts is to miss the burning, glowing spirit and fail in the interpretation of the living facts of history.

We have sought in the foregoing pages to indicate the inherent vitality of Scripture. We have marked the increasing purpose that runs from beginning to end, a purpose that made history a veritable sacrament of the redeeming grace of God. Too often, in the matter of Bible interpretation, we fail to see the wood for the trees, but the view set

¹² Matt. 2:15.

¹³ Matt. 27:9, Zech. 11:12.

¹⁴ Matt. 21:7.

¹⁵ Peake, A. S., *op. cit.*, p. 368.

forth here should enable us to "see all the land." As we began by showing the vitality of the Bible in an individual case, we will conclude by looking at its vital influence in the world.

This is the Book that is alive. Our tragedy today is that we treat the Bible as a dead thing, a cadaver, to be dissected and analyzed. We labor on the letter and miss the vital spirit that informs "the lively oracles of God." We solemnly enunciate our theories of inspiration, but the proof of the inspiration of the Bible lies in the fact that it has inspired and continues to inspire all great living and sacrificial endeavor. Here we have a book which thousands of great men through the centuries have reverenced in proportion to their greatness, a book for which, in every age, warriors have fought, philosophers labored, and martyrs bled. Heathen writers like Longinus marked its literary splendor and marveled at its power and passion. Origen and Jerome devoted their lives to its interpretation and promulgation, and it inspired the eloquence of Gregory and Chrysostom. It shaped the massive thoughts of Augustine and Athanasius, and later it produced the theology of Aquinas and the *Imitatio Christi* of Thomas à Kempis. The passionate sympathy of the Old Testament prophets for the poor and oppressed is without parallel in the ancient world, and they have inspired philanthropists and patriots through all the ages. St. Vincent de Paul caught a spark of the substitutionary love of Christ and the missionary zeal of Francis Xavier was kindled at the same source. The humanitarian labors of John Howard and William Wilberforce had no other origin than this. Nor is it otherwise with great literature. Milton, Shakespeare, Spencer, Chaucer echo its teachings: from Cowper to Wordsworth, from Coleridge to Tennyson, the Bible has been the main fountain of all great poetic work. To it, too, we owe the art of Fra Angelico and Raphael, the music of Handel and Mendelssohn. The intrepid genius of Luther, the glowing imagination of Bunyan, the passionate zeal of Whitfield, all spring from the Bible. The hundred best books, the hundred best pictures, the hundred greatest strains of music—all owe their being and origin to the Bible. It is the *fons et origo* of beauty and power: it is the living dynamic word, the Book that is alive.

“The Private Devotions”—A Theological Reprint

Lancelot Andrewes (1555-1626)

Born in London, Andrewes obtained his theological training at both Cambridge and Oxford, became Bishop of Chichester, Ely, and Winchester, also Privy Councillor of England, and one of the translators of the King James Bible. He was a favorite of James I and other government leaders—a difficult position for a true Christian. His *Private Devotions*, beautifully written in Greek and Latin, giving large place to penitence, were his unique gift to the world; “that book belonged to no other than to pure and primitive devotion.” It was published posthumously in English (1675, Oxford Press). The edition here used is that of Thomas S. Kepler, Oberlin, Ohio.

INTERCESSION

O hope of all the ends of the earth
and of them that remain in the broad sea;
O thou on whom our fathers hoped,
 and thou didst deliver them;
 on whom they waited,
 and were not confounded;
 O my Hope from my youth,
 from my mother's breasts;
on whom I have been cast from the womb,
 be thou my hope
 now and evermore,
and my portion in the land of the living.

My Hope,
let me not be disappointed of my hope.
O the hope of all the ends of the earth,
remember thy whole creation for good,
 visit the world in thy compassion;

O guardian of men,

O loving Lord,

remember all our race.

Thou who hast shut up all in unbelief,
 on all have pity, O Lord.

O thou who didst die and rise again,
to be Lord both of the dead and living,
 live we or die we,
 Thou art our Lord;

Lord, have pity on living and dead.

O helper of the helpless,
seasonable aid in affliction,
remember all who are in necessity,
and need thy succour.

O grant to all believers,
one heart and one soul.

Thou that walkest amid the golden
candlesticks,
remove not our candlestick
out of its place.

Amend what are wanting,
establish what remain,
which thou art ready to cast away,
which are ready to die.

O Lord of the harvest
send forth labourers,
made sufficient by thee,
into thy harvest.

O portion of those
who wait in thy temple,
grant to our clergy,
rightly to divide the word of truth,
rightly to walk in it;
grant to thy Christian people
to obey and submit to them.

O King of nations, unto the ends
of the earth;
strengthen all the states
of the inhabited world,
as being thy ordinance,
though a creation of man.

Scatter the nations that delight in war,
make wars to cease in all the earth.

O expectation of the isles and their hope,
Lord, save this island,
and all the country in which we sojourn,
from all affliction, peril, and need.

"To Be Confined . . . and Dishonorably Discharged"

FREDERICK W. BRINK

The Chaplain in a Naval Disciplinary Barracks seeks to remedy failures of church and family—boys in prison show need for better training in responsibility.

"THE COURT therefore sentences you to be reduced to the rating of apprentice seaman, to be confined for a period of three and one-sixth years, to be dishonorably discharged from the United States naval service, and to suffer all the other accessories of said sentence as prescribed by Naval Courts and Boards."

Words similar to those have been read to approximately a thousand servicemen who now reside within the solid masonry walls and iron fences of what was once a Federal prison. The prison is now the United States Naval Disciplinary Barracks, Terminal Island, San Pedro, California. Built in 1938 as a Federal prison, it has since the early days of the war been one of the two permanent places of confinement for members of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard who are required to serve General Courts Martial sentences. With the Disciplinary Barracks at Portsmouth, New Hampshire, and the temporary Retraining Commands at Mare Island, California, and Norfolk, Virginia, it forms the home of the slightly over 3,000 naval personnel in such confinement.

A General Court Martial in the military system is reserved for the most serious of military offenses, for repeated offenders, or for members of the military service who would have been tried by jury in civil courts if they had not been remanded to military jurisdiction. In the naval disciplinary system, every man who is found guilty by General Court Martial is subject to confinement, reduction to the lowest rate of his branch of the service, loss of all pay and allowances, and either a bad conduct or a dishonorable conduct discharge. Either of these discharges will automatically prohibit the man from receiving the benefits of the so-called G.I. Bill of Rights. Receiving a dishonorable discharge for an offense of desertion in time of war automatically removes from a man the right to vote and the right to hold any public office.

As of the first of September, 1947, there were 3,477 naval prisoners serving General Courts Martial sentences. That number represented a

reduction from the approximately 11,000 who were in such confinement when the war ended in 1945. By the first of July, 1948, it is probable that the number will be reduced to a static 2,500 or less. Not all of the men formerly in confinement were required to take their undesirable discharges. Approximately 30 per cent of them were restored to duty on their own request, with the approval of the Navy Department, to serve a period of probation and thereby regain their right to a discharge under honorable conditions. The rest either had offenses or records that prohibited such probationary periods, or did not wish to make the effort to clear their records.

The charges of the men confined on Terminal Island range through the whole gamut of crime, both military and civil. There is the man who missed his ship by a matter of hours and then stayed away for an additional month, and the man who absented himself from combat while under fire. There is the repeated offender of relatively short absences, and the man who deserted for four and a half years. There is the boy who had a fight with a shipmate and the man who murdered his commanding officer. There is the Marine who stole a wallet and the one who robbed a Japanese bank of \$35,000. There is the man who "borrowed" a parked jeep and the one who "borrowed" a well-filled railway train. There is the sailor who went AWOL to get married and the one who violated native women. There is the man who stole and distributed a few cases of beer and the one who stole and sold 1,100 pounds of butter. Name a military or a civil crime, and somewhere in the Barracks will be found a man who committed it.

In the final analysis these men are confined as much for the faults of others as for their own misconduct. In their formative days they were never given any true sense of responsibility to others, there was nothing constructive in their home environment, and the principles of the Christian religion were never made to apply to their conduct.

Take for example one man who is confined for desertion. He was stationed aboard a ship with a crew of a thousand men. He hadn't had a leave for six months and he felt that he was entitled to a vacation. He looked at his job aboard ship and reasoned that 999 men could run the ship as well as a thousand. As a boy no one had ever taught him at home, in school, or in the church, that he had any responsibility to someone other than himself. He stayed ashore, the ship sailed, and several months later he was picked up and found guilty of desertion.

Another man is confined for disposing of government property. He

had been placed in charge of a foodstuffs warehouse. He saw men profiting by selling items on the black market, or by disposing of government items to unauthorized people. He knew there were people who would be willing to pay him what seemed like large sums of money just to pass out a few extra cases of butter or sacks of sugar. Back home he had observed that condemnation came to a person for such activity only when he was caught, and he thought he could get away with it. The question of whether it was right or wrong did not really enter his thinking. Accordingly, he sold the butter, pocketed the money, and ended up with a General Court Martial sentence and confinement at the Disciplinary Barracks.

Sometimes the reason for these men being in confinement can be traced to this lack of the proper teaching of responsibility or the lack of a clear distinction between right and wrong. At other times the reason lies in the absence of a stable home environment.

The man who sat across the desk from the chaplain and explained his repeated absences without leave by saying he could not seem to adjust himself, and then said that he wanted to get home to care for his mother, excited sympathy. But when he explained that his mother had just divorced her sixth husband, and that now, at the age of eighteen, he could remember four fathers but not his own, his instability was explained. His desire to accept his dishonorable discharge rather than attempt a period of probation in order to regain his right to a discharge under honorable conditions excited pity as well as sympathy. His absences were easily attributable to the home out of which he came.

So, too, is the absence of the man who went "over the hill" just to get things straightened out with his wife. He admitted to the chaplain that all the time he had been growing up, his parents had alternately separated and come back together, again and again. The failure of his marriage and the absence caused by that failure can hardly be called his fault.

The church cannot hold itself free of blame for some of the men who are confined at the Disciplinary Barracks. In many cases the church itself has fallen down on the job. A typical conversation between the chaplain and a new arrival will sound something like this.

"You list yourself as a Protestant. Are you a church member?"

"No, sir."

"Do you know whether your parents ever had you baptized as a child?"

"I don't think so, sir."

"How often did you go to church before you came into the service?"

"I went fairly regular—a couple of times a month or maybe once a month."

"What church did you usually attend when you were at home?"

"The Protestant church."

"Yes, I know that, but was it a Methodist or a Baptist or a Lutheran or a Pentecostal church or what?"

"It was a Protestant church, sir."

And with that they feel they have answered the question. The church made so little impression on them that they cannot even remember its name. Sometimes the man will consider himself a member because he attended a few times. Too often they are frank to admit that they seldom if ever attended, especially after the age of twelve or thirteen. More often than not they are not able to recall any constructive teaching they received in church. The church has failed to reach many of the men whose later conduct put them in confinement.

Even more tragic, however, is the failure of the church to influence men who were constantly within its reach. In the past year, at least four minister's sons have been in confinement. Large numbers of the men state that they attended church and Sunday school regularly until they entered the service. Some were given careful training in extensive confirmation classes. But somewhere along the line the religious experience fell short of having any practical influence on conduct.

The men in the Disciplinary Barracks are serving sentences adjudged for particular offenses. Had they been better prepared for life's problems they might never have committed the offenses. But they did, and the confinement is their punishment. Quite contrary to what occurs in some civilian institutions, and completely contrary to the reports that were widely circulated regarding some military brigs overseas, confinement at a Naval Disciplinary Barracks includes no abuse or undue hardship.

THE NAVY'S PHILOSOPHY OF CONFINEMENT¹

Through its Corrective Services Division of the Bureau of Naval Personnel, the Navy Department has developed a definite philosophy of confinement. This philosophy is revealed in the entire program as

¹ Certain of the paragraphs in this section are taken from a pamphlet written by the author and printed in 1947 by the Navy Department, describing the rehabilitation program at the Disciplinary Barracks.

carried on at the Naval Disciplinary Barracks. In general, it is based on the premise:

. . . men are placed in confinement as punishment rather than for punishment, and that the dual mission of every place of confinement is to carry out sentences as approved, and to develop, co-ordinate, and regulate its program in such a manner that those prisoners who demonstrate their fitness for further service shall be restored to active duty honorably and the remaining prisoners shall be discharged in condition to meet the duties and obligations of good citizens successfully.²

Basically it must be remembered that the inmates of any place of confinement would not be there except for their own misconduct. They have failed to conform to the established rules of their society, either deliberately or because they are not capable of fitting into that society. Their lack of conformity has made it necessary to remove them for a time by a period of confinement from the normal routines of that society.

This holds true in the case of men confined under military jurisdiction. Some would have been confined in civilian institutions had they not been members of the military service, because their offenses violated civil statutes. Others, having violated only military regulations, would probably not have been in confinement had they been in civilian status. Relatively few of the men confined in a military place of confinement will fall in the class of dangerous criminals, sexual perverts, or constitutional psychopathic inferiors—largely because of screening procedures at the time of their induction into the service.

The Navy works on the principle that this confinement shall insure safe custody without abuse. Escapes must be prevented and the introduction of contraband, such as liquor, narcotics, weapons, and the like, must be forestalled. But the temporary segregation from his normal society must not be allowed to destroy the man's chances of success when he is returned to that society.

The requirements of safe custody must not therefore be permitted to introduce a program of idleness, even though enforced idleness may represent the easiest form of custody. To achieve the proper eventual restoration to society, the Navy Department has maintained that its prisoners should be kept busy at useful work or constructive recreation as nearly 100 per cent of their waking time as possible. The Navy provides that General Courts Martial prisoners shall be assisted while in confinement in preparing themselves for the future. The vocational, educational, and morale program of which they become a part while

²Manual for Naval Places of Confinement, Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, p. ii.

serving their adjudged confinement is the major means of accomplishing this.

In some cases the program fails. That must be admitted. Every so often word comes back that a man who was restored to duty and earned his discharge under honorable conditions repeated his Navy offense and is embroiled in civil discipline. Men who completed sentences for desertion find jobs but desert their employment as they deserted the Navy. Failure must be expected in some cases, but side by side with the failures must be placed the success of a great many others. Hardly a week goes by without a man coming back to tell how he has adjusted to civilian life, or without a letter being received that tells the same thing. Listen to these excerpts from typical letters:

"I haven't been in any trouble since I was discharged and I don't intend to be as long as I live.

"I am now working as sales engineer for the . . . Construction Company of . . . I have been trying in some small way to explain and to interest the businessmen with whom I come in contact to hire and employ men who have been discharged with Dishonorable or Bad Conduct Discharges. They have been very co-operative. I have explained to them the methods and the education and training that is offered the men while in confinement.

"This ship has been in the yard for three months and some time later in the month is going to San Diego. By that time my probation will be over and I shall be on my terminal leave, but the way things look now I'm shipping over."

The program that prepares these men to return either to further duty in the naval service or to good civilian citizenship demands an individualized treatment, in which personal counsel and consideration is given to every man and to his case. A brief description of what happens to a General Court Martial prisoner from the time he receives his sentence through his confinement will serve to outline the program of the Disciplinary Barracks at San Pedro as it contributes to that preparation.

Having been tried, found guilty, and sentenced by General Court Martial, the prisoner is sent under guard to the Disciplinary Barracks. Unless clemency is granted and that portion of the sentence involving discharge is remitted, he has arrived at his last duty station. His service records are logged in, and he himself is immediately introduced to the Quarantine section where he receives a receipt for his clothing and valuables, new clothing is issued him, he is medically examined, bathed, gets his hair cut, is photographed, and is entered on the roster.

For the next two weeks he goes through an intensive indoctrination program during which his social history is obtained and verified, he is

familiarized with barracks regulations, his records are checked, and his entire naval career recorded. He attends various indoctrination lectures by the Commanding Officer, the Chaplain, the Legal Officer, the Red Cross Field Director, and other members of the staff. He has personal interviews with the Chaplain, the Classification Officer, the Psychiatrist, the Educational Officer, the Vocational Counselor, and other staff officers, with a summary of each interview being incorporated into his records. He participates in regular military drill and other calisthenics. His desired visitors and correspondents are checked and arranged.

At the end of his quarantine period, when all of his records have been compiled and examined, he is interviewed by the Assignment Board where his custody classification is determined and his work assignment is made. Insofar as possible his work assignment is made on the basis of his own request and interests, as well as his training and background. He then is transferred to one of the barracks and becomes an active member of the Disciplinary Barracks population, privileged to receive ten letters a week, to write four, and to have immediate relatives visit him once every other week.

His normal day's routine includes eight hours of constructive activity. Men suited for training of a specialized nature are at their request assigned to one of the full-time vocational schools. Here in sixteen-week courses they may prepare themselves in auto mechanics, mechanical drawing, diesel engineering, radio servicing, radio operation, or book-keeping and accounting. A certificate of satisfactory completion of the course is given where deserved, which can be used by the man in procuring employment upon release.

If a man does not desire to attend one of the vocational schools he receives on-the-job training in one of the maintenance shops or industrial activities. In the shops he learns to be a machinist, carpenter, electrician, plumber, sheet-metal worker, electric arc welder, cement finisher, cook, baker, butcher, barber, or something else. In the industries section he becomes skilled by working at landscaping, garage mechanics, box manufacture, athletic repair, shoe cobbling, laundry work, dry cleaning, typewriter repair, photographic laboratory, motion-picture projection, and other jobs of similar nature. In every case, the work done by the men serves the double purpose of training for the future and performing useful work for the Navy.

For men deficient in academic lines there is a complete elementary school. For others there is specialized training in such things as secretarial

work, typing, and modern languages. High-school work may be carried on by correspondence through the facilities of the Armed Forces Institute, and a large number of high-school diplomas are awarded to men still in confinement.

When the work day has ended the program carries on with free and organized recreation. Athletic contests among the inmates and with outside teams that visit the barracks, free access to the excellent library of 5,500 volumes, three movies or other entertainment features weekly, and a station newspaper published weekly by and for the benefit of the men comprise a major part of this program. Biweekly boxing smokers with the prisoners putting on their own bouts have become a prominent part of the recreation program.

Divine services and religious counseling are of course a part of the program, with both a Protestant and Roman Catholic chaplain being assigned to the barracks. No man, regardless of his status in confinement, is ever refused the privilege of conference with the chaplain or of attendance at the divine services of his choice. Representatives of the Hebrew, Mormon, and Christian Science groups make periodic visits to the men of their respective faiths.

After he has served a prescribed portion of his sentence the prisoner becomes eligible for consideration by the Clemency Board. He is interviewed at length by the Chaplain, the Psychiatrist, and the Assignment Officer in preparation for this consideration. Then he comes before the Board itself to state his desires as regards his future. The Board, composed of the three who have interviewed him with the addition of the Legal Officer, and the Commanding Officer or his representative as senior member, considers his request in the light of his record and all available information about him, then informs him of their decision. That decision may be to recommend reduction of sentence with a view to further action later, to recommend his discharge at a set date, or to recommend his restoration to duty on probation. Only by restoration to duty and the satisfactory completion of a period of probation can he have his bad conduct discharge or his dishonorable discharge remitted and be granted a discharge under honorable conditions. The Board may withhold its action and consider his request again at a later date. Final decision rests with the Prison Sentence Review and Clemency Board of the Navy Department to which the local Clemency Board refers its recommendation.

Upon receipt of the decision from the Navy Department's Board, the appropriate action is taken on the man's behalf, either restoring him to

duty, discharging him, or bringing him back before the Board for a further recommendation as instructed. If he is to be restored to duty his orders are prepared, his sea bag reissued, and he is transferred to the nearest Receiving Station or Marine Barracks for further assignment, to serve his period of probation and re-earn his right to a discharge under honorable conditions. If he is to be discharged he is assisted, as far as possible, in finding employment, is informed of his civil rights, is issued civilian clothing and transportation to his home, and is simultaneously released from confinement and discharged from the naval service.

If he is the average prisoner he has been confined ten to eleven months, though his original sentence was two and a half years. Upon arrival he had a 25-per-cent chance of being restored to duty on probation. At one time his chance was better, but many of his fellows, if not he himself, are serving their second or third General Courts Martial confinement and so have precluded their own opportunity for restoration. But he goes out of the barracks in most cases a healthier, wiser man than he entered, prepared by its program to be a better, more useful member of his community.

THE CHAPLAIN'S PLACE IN THE PROGRAM

The Chaplain is privileged to play a major part in the entire program of the Naval Disciplinary Barracks. There are distinct times in the progress of a prisoner when the Chaplain has an official voice in the man's disposition. The first comes when, after a preliminary talk to the group of new arrivals, he interviews each man personally to determine his religious and social background, temperament, and desires. The report that the Chaplain makes after this interview becomes a part of the man's permanent record and is used with other reports in determining the program the man will follow during his confinement. Later, when the man has served the prescribed portion of his particular sentence and comes before the Clemency Board, the Chaplain is one of the three Board members who personally interviews the man before his hearing and then serves as one of the five voting members of the Board itself.

As a voting member of this Board the Chaplain has much to say about the man's future, for it is from this hearing that a man is recommended for duty or discharge. In addition to these two formal occasions on which he helps to plot a man's future, the Chaplain is one of the counselors of the Commanding Officer on all occasions of disciplinary action required by misconduct during the period of confinement.

The Chaplain is given complete freedom in the conduct of religious services and instruction classes. Attendance at divine services is entirely voluntary, but about 30 per cent of the men choose to attend. Approximately 200 of the 750 Protestant men are in church every Sunday, while 55 or 60 of the 250 Catholic men attend mass.

Being privileged to call men from work details for religious instruction, the Chaplain has an extraordinary opportunity for work of this nature. At the Disciplinary Barracks at Terminal Island the Roman Catholic Chaplain conducts a weekly instruction class and the Protestant Chaplain conducts two weekday classes, each meeting once a week for a period of six weeks. One is a class designed as an introduction to personal Bible reading and study, with approximately thirty men in attendance every six weeks and a waiting list for the next class before the current class is ended. The other is a somewhat smaller class, but with a similar waiting list, of men preparing for Christian baptism, church membership, or general instruction in the basic principles of the Protestant faith.

The response to the services and to the classes is definite and measurable. In the year 1947, for example, eighteen men received Protestant Christian baptism while confined at the barracks. In each case the baptism was administered in the presence of the entire congregation—a fact which called for an extra degree of conviction and sincerity, and which provided the opportunity for group instruction in the meaning of the sacraments. In addition, twenty-three men were received into the membership of churches in their home communities after their course of instruction, even though still confined. The ecumenical nature of such an activity is shown by the fact that the churches with which these men united ranged from Seventh Day Adventist to Episcopal, from Pentacostal and Four Square Gospel to Presbyterian.

The spiritual opportunity and challenge of conducting services for the congregation of two hundred men, and of the instruction classes, is matched by the opportunity presented in the personal counseling in which the Chaplain engages. With every inmate having a personal interview on arrival and many voluntarily coming in for a farewell interview upon leaving, and every man being interviewed before his clemency hearing, the Chaplain has a tremendous opportunity. But in addition to these there is a steady stream of men who seek his counsel on matters ranging from divorce and marriage to the settlement of unacknowledged debts to individuals or society, from past mistakes to future plans. The Chap-

lain is always available for a personal interview with any inmate and averages about twenty such conferences every day.

One after another these men bring their problems to the Chaplain. John Smith does not feel that he can write home while he is confined. He has let his family down by his misconduct and he does not feel he can tell them where he is or why. To persuade him that his parents would rather know and share his difficulty is the task of the Chaplain. Henry Jones finds that a wife he thought had procured a divorce has not actually done so. In the meantime he has married a second girl without her knowing of the first marriage. To help break the news to the second wife that she is not legally married and to convince her that the man was sincere in his alliance with her, while at the same time urging her to procure an annulment while the first wife procures a divorce, is again the Chaplain's task.

Sam Brown's family writes that they cannot receive their son home as he has disgraced the family name. The Chaplain must talk with Sam and then by correspondence persuade the family that they are unappreciative of the true nature of their son. James Conner's wife writes that she is unable to carry the load of the family any longer by herself and feels that a divorce will help. The Chaplain tries by correspondence to support the man's desire for reconciliation. In a month's time the Chaplain writes between 150 and 200 personal letters to families regarding problems connected with the confinement or release of their sons or husbands.

Other men come in on strictly religious problems. John Scott, a member of the station orchestra, explains that he feels all the religion he needs can be found in music. By a series of personal conversations the Chaplain tries to build from that beginning to a firm Christian faith. Robert Henry must be given the answers to questions of Protestant faith and practice in order to be able to make a successful home with his Roman Catholic wife. Harvey Roberts has to be reassured that the failure to do his task in the Navy has not cut him off from God, and Robert Brown needs to be shown that he is not a hypocrite to begin church attendance while in confinement.

Out of all this personal contact, and out of the multitude of men who are interviewed and whose records are known, certain lessons could be pointed out, not for chaplains and ministers alone, but for everyone.

The most important is that something must be done to bring religion out of the realm of the pulpit into the realm of the market place and the

school. While the men in confinement reveal that in many cases the church failed miserably to translate religious principles into principles of conduct, in a multitude of other cases the religious principles were never even heard, simply because they never left the four walls of the church in which they were pronounced. When a Navy training station has to include in its program a program of lectures on character and citizenship, as is now being done for all men entering the Navy, something is definitely missing in the community at home. The men in the Disciplinary Barracks are the glaring proofs of the absence of any true application of religious principles and teaching, and any true program of religious living at home.

To pin the blame down, it is evident that the educational program of the local church has wrongly assumed that presence in the church or the Sunday school in and of itself indicates acceptance of the religious principles for which the church stands. No other school assumes such a thing. The educational program of the local church must be regeared to prove the superiority of Christian practice not only over anti-Christian practices but over those practices which are just non-Christian. The educational and pastoral program of the local church must be rethought to place the attention not only on the nurturing of the children of the faithful but the reaching of the children of the outsider. It is not enough to wait for the youth or the adult to come to the church; the church must go to him in a language that will be accepted and understood. The men in confinement reveal a great willingness to accept and to learn when they understand that there is something more than restriction in religion, when they realize that the program of Christianity is practical, and when the traditional religious phrases are made understandable to them. Their commonest objection is that they never saw that there was any need for them to practice a religious life. Their religious life was marked not so much by any deliberate refusal as by an absence of any sense of need.

The home can do what the church, even with the best of educational methods and facilities, cannot always do, because the home has an informal atmosphere and an association with others outside the church that cannot be forced. If within the home there can be developed a new recognition of character and responsibility and the relevance of Christian teaching to life, many young people still there will be spared the experience of a disciplinary institution. First, however, homemakers must be shown from before the time the home is established that what is learned at home will be reflected outside.

The general program of the Disciplinary Barracks is designed, as far as possible, to correct the mistakes of the broken homes, the neglectful homes, the misguided and inefficient churches, the destructive social influences to which the men were subjected before their naval career and their confinement. The Disciplinary Barracks program succeeds in some cases, but not in all. The Chaplain at the Disciplinary Barracks may be able to help some men to realize that the great Christian doctrines of forgiveness, new life, beginning again, service to others are practical realities. He may help them catch a glimpse of their place in society so that they are more willing to assume their full share of life's responsibilities within their own home and community. He may be able to help counteract the ill effects of an unwholesome home background, save a threatened marriage, or build toward a secure life in the family future.

But the youths still at home, the young people of every community, must learn the true nature of the family by seeing the family in action, and must be trained in responsibility by their parents and by the church while they are still at home. The Chaplain's opportunity within the Disciplinary Barracks is tremendous. The opportunity of every parent and churchman is even greater.

[The opinions or assertions contained herein are the private ones of the writer and not to be construed as official or reflecting the views of the Navy Department or of the naval service at large.]

Christianity and Liberty*

CECIL NORTHCOTT

The original Christian gospel proclaimed freedom—but later Christian attitudes paradoxically both affirmed and denied it.

THE RECORD of the Christian Church in relation to religious liberty is not unblemished. Inclusivism was a dominant theme of Catholic Christianity, which logically meant intolerance and compulsion. Society and its structure demanded religious obedience, for if that proved unstable the whole edifice of life was threatened. This attitude naturally meant that heresy had to be exterminated, making persecution inevitable, however foreign it seemed to the essential Christian spirit.

Early Protestantism, too, followed in the same strain, although Luther in his finer moments could write, "Heresy is a spiritual thing, which no iron can hew down, no fire burn, no water drown."¹ Melanchthon fumed against heretics in the true medieval manner and wrote to congratulate Calvin on the burning of Servetus. While the Reformation fathers themselves made no distinct contribution to the growth of religious liberty, they drew Christendom's attention to the Scriptures and to the high doctrine of the free man the Scriptures contained—the most liberating act they could perform.

It is one of the paradoxes of Christianity that it holds within itself revolutionary teaching about liberty for the individual and what often seems to be a reactionary intolerance in dealing with the results of liberty. The Christian gospel was preached as a message of freedom. Christ made men free from the bondage of law and gave them a new liberty as sons of God. He delivered them from the fear of death, from over-concern about daily living, and by his own life, death, and resurrection provided a fresh appraisement for the life of man. The human soul was of immeasurable value in the sight of God, and any slight upon the most humble human being was a denial of the essential sonship of man. Christ himself preached no systematic doctrine of liberty. The fact of Christian liberty arose naturally out of the new Kingdom inaugurated by God as

*Mr. Northcott's book, *Religious Liberty*, to which this article is related, was published by The Student Christian Movement Press, London, March, 1948, in their Religious Book Club and also in a separate edition.

¹ Quoted by M. Searle Bates, *Religious Liberty: An Inquiry*. Harper & Brothers, 1945, p. 155.

the Father of all men, and the pattern of human life is based not on "rights" and "claims" but on filial relationships.

In dealing with individual men Christ was clearly on the side of an open and voluntary fellowship rather than a compulsory allegiance. In St. Luke's Gospel, James and John asked Christ to "bid fire come down from heaven and consume" those who refused to receive him (Luke 9:54) and he rejected the demand as alien to the spirit of his teaching. He rebuked his disciples for their suggestion, seeing in it the seeds of a persecuting spirit foreign to his nature and purpose.

He knew that his Kingdom could only be established upon the voluntary allegiance of men, and that no compulsion could be justified. When official Christianity has departed from this view and resorted to intolerance and persecution, it has departed violently from the spirit of the Master. Much of its persecuting spirit may have appeared historically justifiable and necessary, but judged by the standards of Christ it stands condemned.

All through the New Testament the strain of intolerance is a spiritual intolerance rather than a physical one. The Christian faith was born into a world which was hostile to a belief claiming such high authority and such exclusive attributes. Christ himself criticized the prevailing religious system of his day with epithets such as "blind guides and hypocrites," and with a condemnation of those who made void the Word of God because of their traditions. He was stern and unsparing of those in official religious positions who abused their positions and privileges for their own ends, and wherever he saw power being used unintelligently he withered it with scorn. But his weapons were words. There is no hint in his teaching that the new belief should be imposed on unwilling minds by force. He used satire, scorn, argument, appeals to conscience and solemn warnings of judgment to come, but there was no suggestion that his followers should regard themselves as instruments of judgment.

No one in the New Testament is more outspoken about false doctrine and false teachers than St. Paul. He warns his friends in the churches of "false apostles, deceitful workers, fashioning themselves into apostles of Christ" (II Cor. 11:13-15), and against "the enemies of the cross of Christ, whose end is perdition, whose god is the belly who mind earthly things" (Phil. 3:18-19). In his letters to Timothy his young colleague is advised to "take heed to thyself and to thy teaching" (I Tim. 4:16), to "charge certain men not to teach a different doctrine" (1:3), and to guard his flock against the evils of the "hypocrisy of men that speak lies, branded in their own conscience as with a hot iron" (4:2).

All the apostle's censures are directed against the character of the false teachers coupled with a warning to his hearers and correspondents not to be misled by them.

In the Epistle to the Galatians St. Paul deals with teaching directly contrary to the faith he was advocating. He meets the attempts of the Judaizers to contract Christianity into a sect of their faith with fierce denunciation; he insists that what has happened in Jesus Christ is a new event in religious history, and defends his own position as an apostle with strong personal feeling. But there are no hints or threats of persecution against the Judaizers. On the contrary, the apostle argues that the Jewish system must be tested by its own fruits in the same way as Christianity. The only demand he makes is that the new faith shall be given freedom to grow and develop and not be brought back again into the bondage of the law.

This spiritual liberty is the birthright of the Christian believer, who accepts the lordship of Christ—that is the apostle's thesis all through the significant pages of the Galatian epistle. From the bondage of "the law" the new man in Christ is delivered into a new relationship with God where such problems as circumcision, the sabbath and its ritual, and the minute observances of the law are removed from the shoulders of the believer. He puts on a living garment of faith which supplants the rigorous casing of the law-regime. He is a member of a new humanity which transcends all racial superiority and is inclusive of diverse cultures and national allegiances. The Christian stands amongst a reborn citizenry, who have freedom as their birthright. Paul was proud of his Jewish heritage which he regarded as being fulfilled in Christ, and all he asked of his Galatian friends was liberty for the new faith. There was no compulsion to believe, and no uniformity demanded of the Christian believer—except the uniformity of sincerity.

The test of sincerity seems to be the one universal New Testament test. Any other imperfections of faith, knowledge, or love could be remedied by the working of the Spirit, but the elementary condition of sincerity was the essential foundation of the Christian life. Apostolic denunciations, which wax louder and sharper toward the end of the New Testament, are all charged with the danger of paganism, profligacy of all sorts, sins of the flesh, and the poisoning of the pure stream of the faith by the infiltration of pagan customs. It was in defending the purity of its life against these encroachments that Christianity in the New Testament developed its strain of intolerance—a position which grew naturally

out of its unique belief in Jesus as the revelation of God, and that in him is the way, the truth, and the life.

From the very first [says Mandell Creighton] the difficulty was to escape the snares, not of the world at its worst, but of the world at its best. Faithful souls saw the truth of the gospel and thought that they had made it their own. But the world-spirit in its most attractive form gathered round them. They were men of sincerity, men who were in earnest. It is just such men of whom the world stands most in need. Judaism would not let them go; paganism would not let them go. They pleaded that they professed that they were willing to be reformed, to be spiritualized, to be extended; they urged the vastly superior field of influence which they could offer to those who would make use of them in moderation; they warned the inconspicuous body struggling into existence of the futility of their hopes; they suggested partnership. Many of the new converts were ready to listen. The experiment was worth trying. We know as a matter of history how little the experiment availed. We hear in the utterances of the apostles the cries of leaders who saw the real issue, the disastrous issue, of this futile compromise. Men may accept it, or reject the Christian faith, they assert; but if they accept it, they must accept it as it is. Jesus Christ cannot be obscured by Jewish ritual, nor will he receive men's souls while their bodies are left to paganism. Yet the old systems, which were in possession, strove desperately to lay their hands on him and make him and his their own.²

But in all this crucial fight in the New Testament churches to defend the purity of the young and developing faith, and to keep the Christian life within the churches unsullied, there was no hint of persecution. The coercive authority of the church exercised in later times can find no ground for its claims in the New Testament. It is a long cry indeed from the denunciations of St. Paul for false teaching to the methods of the medieval Inquisition for stamping it out.

However much official Christianity may have departed from the New Testament practice of nonpersecution, it has always rediscovered there the basis of Christian belief in the supremacy of the individual personality. Personal liberty for the Christian is rooted in his belief in God and Christ's revelation of the nature of God. That for him is part of the nature of ultimate reality, and it is there that personal liberty finds its origin. If the Christian faith is the ultimate truth about God and man, then the sanctity of human personality and the liberties which go with it are sustained by the Christian faith, and if that is denied then liberty itself disappears.

The New Testament and the Christian faith in history are witnesses to the freedom conferred on man by the Christian revelation—a fact rarely recognized except at moments of contemporary crisis as in Western Europe

² Mandell Creighton, *Persecution and Tolerance*. London: MacMillan, 1895. pp. 65ff.

at the present time, when the foundations of liberty and the meaning of man and his place in ordered community life are up for judgment. It is Christianity's great achievement in the West that it has woven its belief in the sanctity of human personality and the liberty of the individual man into the conscience of Western Europe. If no single nation has fully translated this Christian teaching into its practical way of life, the general conscience of Western European thought has been quickened and irrigated by the doctrine. Liberty of conscience, liberty of speech, and liberty of association (not always actively promoted by official Christianity) find their true home and source in God's view of man as seen in Christ's revelation. Religious liberty is clearly linked with these general liberties, and it cannot logically be separated out from amongst them.

It was remarked by James Harrington during the vital seventeenth-century debates in England that "without liberty of conscience civil liberty cannot be perfect; and without civil liberty liberty of conscience cannot be perfect."⁸ The English achievement of civil and religious liberties shows that the two are mightily linked together, and that a threat to one means a threat to the other. John Milton believed that a free commonwealth in which civil liberty was already established would be more likely than any other government to favor and protect "this liberty of conscience, which above all other things ought to be to all men dearest and most precious."⁹

Two apt comments on the modern scene are recorded by Dr. Searle Bates, one a quotation from Anne McCormick, writing in the *New York Times*, in October, 1941, on religious liberty in Russia:

Stalin cannot reverse the fixed policy of more than twenty years and allow not merely freedom of worship, which exists in Russia in the sense that churches are still open, but freedom to teach religion, without opening the way to other revolutionary changes. For liberty, like peace and war, is indivisible. It is impossible to grant freedom of worship without granting freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly. Religious liberty cannot exist without civil liberty and vice versa.¹⁰

And this from a German Catholic pastoral letter of March 22, 1942:

We emphasize that before the authorities we not only stand up for religious and clerical rights, but likewise for the human rights bestowed by God on mankind. Every honest human being is interested in the respect and preservation of these rights; without them the entire Western culture must break down.

Every man has the natural right for personal freedom within the boundaries

⁸ Quoted by Wilbur K. Jordan, *The Development of Religious Toleration in England*. Harvard University Press, 1941, vol. iv, p. 289.

⁹ Quoted by M. Searle Bates, *op. cit.*, p. 347.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 344.

designated by obedience to God, consideration of his fellow men and the common good and the just laws of the civil authorities.⁶

While it is true that religious liberty has not been (as is popularly supposed) the first of the liberties to flourish in the modern state, the struggle for religious tolerance has been a major force working for general liberty in Western Europe. In their witness against state absolutism both the Catholic and Protestant churches helped to preserve the integrity of the individual conscience, but there is also plenty of evidence that official Catholic action has often been against liberty and democracy, and that the submissiveness of Lutherans and Anglicans to state authority enabled their churches to be used to retard the growth of liberty.

The complicated and paradoxical part played by official Christianity in the growth of religious liberty is sufficient warning to the Christian man not to overstate his claim (as is frequently done) that religious liberty is the mother of all other liberties. The development of religious toleration in England alone is sufficient warning that, far from being the earliest liberty, religious liberty was the slowest liberty to develop and flourish. *Magna Charta*, the growth of Law and Parliament, the Petition of Right, and the Bill of Rights, all came in English history before the achievement of religious toleration. Commenting on this Luzzatti, the Italian historian, remarks, "Religious liberty is the most difficult and slowest of liberties to root itself in private life and in the life of the state, and while it ought to be the very basis of a civic community, generally succeeds in being only in its crowning feature."⁷

How and why did the Christian church depart from the simplicities of its early days in relation to liberty of opinion?

The answer is the long and entangled relationship between church and state which began with the official recognition of Christianity in A.D. 313 by the Emperor Constantine. That act brought Christianity into a sphere which was not its own creation, and it paid a big price for its new status backed by the massive organization of the Roman state, which had tried in vain to crush it. Paganism was forbidden, and heretics were rendered obedient by the strong arm of the law. Heresy became a crime against civil society which punished it by death. The attitude of the New Testament in commanding truth by persuasion was superseded by the powerful contention of the state that truth, if it be truth, must be enforced and all brought to believe it.

⁶ Quoted by Bates, *op. cit.*, p. 345.

⁷ Quoted by Bates, *op. cit.*, p. 349.

The close alliance of church and state, which persisted for the thousand years and more from Constantine, and the eventual triumph of the church equipped with the ritual and power of the decayed Roman state, is the history of Western Christendom. Within that partnership the church organized for its believers a theory of discipline and penance, and for the nonbeliever—or holder of erroneous opinions—persecution and punishment. The ecclesiastical system, like civil society, was served by courts, judges, and executioners. As a world power the church was thus equipped to face the devil and all his works, and in defense of the truth the church was arguably right in suppressing error by force.

Persecution for religious opinions, held contrary to official church teaching, became an accepted part of the medieval ecclesiastical pattern and was carried over in the early Reformation period. Persecution and force were used as well to bolster up the ecclesiastical machine, and consequently the state was swift to use its strong arm for secular policies. There is no doubt that the Spanish Inquisition was used by the Spanish monarchy to weld its turbulent peoples into some sort of unity, and that the persecution in Bohemia upheld domination over the Czechs, in the same way that the religious war against the Albigensians strengthened the French monarchy.

These are hard facts which anyone discussing the relationship of Christianity and liberty must be ready to admit. Christianity had departed from its early simplicities. However much persecution theories may be justified by the turbulence of the time, the high issues at stake and the fight for the very life of the Christian faith in the Middle Ages, they are a historic liability for the Christian faith.

A. J. Carlyle, writing of the medieval period, says:

It is unhappily true that the Christian Church, not the Christian religion, . . . forgot its own doctrine that the individual was responsible only to God in spiritual things. St. Augustine's unhappy defense of the persecution of those who differed from the Church was not indeed the sole cause of this, but it contributed much to it, as we can see from the treatment of religious persecution in the Canon Law.

The Church did indeed in some sense defend spiritual liberty, that is its own independence, from the authority of the Temporal Power, but it did this only to put it more completely under the control of the Church itself. This is true not only of the medieval Church, but of the Reformed Churches. It was not till the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries that the Western world recovered from this ruinous error.⁸

⁸ A. J. Carlyle, *Political Liberty*. Oxford University Press, 1941, p. 204.

But the same writer, while admitting the inactivity of the Christian church on behalf of social and political liberty during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, believes that Christian truth has "recognized that the rationale of all authority is in the end nothing but the maintenance of a righteous order," and this fact "did render an immense service to the progress of liberty," and that "the Church has still an important part to play in vindicating this conception of the nature of the authority of society against some mischievous and dangerous political tendencies of the modern world."⁹

These observations sum up the strength and the weakness historically of the Christian position in relation to liberty. On the one hand, by its own gospel, the Christian faith is committed to proclaim liberty; but on the other, its cramping alliances, particularly with the state, have promoted theories of persecution which have often made Christianity liberty's formidable opponent.

The Roman Catholic theory of compulsion and persecution proceeds logically from its view of the church as the receiver and giver of truth, and its recognition that authority resides in a definite group of persons. Continuity of authority—the essence of the compulsive attitude—is visibly provided for in Catholicism; no sinner, unbeliever, or heretic may escape the long arm of ecclesiastical authority. Yet within the Roman Church (according to its modern apologists) there is an abundance of private tolerance, mutual forbearance, and respect for the individual personality and judgment of men; and in our time Western Christendom has seen an ample display of Roman Catholic opposition to the totalitarian claims of the state, in defense of Christian freedom.

Protestantism, although its reforming fathers were as zealous and compulsive as any Catholic in control over conduct and belief, had not the central and continuous authority necessary for really effective persecution. The Protestant theory of the church did not grant to anyone, or any group of people, the final authority to compel; and although in Protestant states the secular arm was frequently used to compel belief, the Reformation fathers, in spite of inconsistencies, believed that truth alone could finally dispel error.

It may fairly be claimed by Protestantism that its belief in toleration and religious liberty grew because they were seen to be essential attributes of Christianity. There were many other supplementary causes

* A. J. Carlyle, *The Christian Church and Liberty*. London: James Clark, 1924, p. 73.

—humanist philosophy, political teaching, and rebellion against the rigid compulsion of Catholicism—but in the main it was the freedom of the Christian man which the Reformation rediscovered, and whose consequences have spread themselves through the civilized world. The incompatibility of the persecuting spirit with the Spirit of Christ; the sacredness of conscience and the view that (in the words of John Donne) “nothing hinders our own salvation more than to deny salvation to all but ourselves,”¹⁰ all combined to inspire within the Protestant churches a love of liberty and religious freedom which was slow in many countries to assert itself in face of state and ecclesiastical authority, but which has been a major contribution to the growth and power of Christianity.

It was the Baptist Roger Williams, from his vehement citadel of freedom in New England, who put the position naïvely but concisely:

(1) *God requireth not an uniformity of Religion to be inacted and inforced in any Civill state; which inforced uniformity (sooner or later) is the greatest occasion of civill Warre, ravishing of conscience, persecution of Christ Jesus in his servants, and of the hypocrisy and destruction of millions of souls.* (2) *It is the will and command of God, that . . . a permission of the most Paganish, Jewish, Turkish or Anti-christian consciences and worships, bee granted to all men in all Nations and Countries. And they are only to bee fought against with that Sword of God's Spirit, the Word of God.* (3) *True civility and Christianity may both flourish in a state or Kingdome, notwithstanding the permission of divers and contrary consciences, either to Jew or Gentile.*¹¹

Williams' second contention is at the heart of the Christian teaching about liberty: there must be freedom for all religions and for those who profess no religion. Although Christianity is essentially an intolerant religion in the sense that it believes the revelation of God in Christ is universal, and that ultimately all men will bow the knee to him who is Lord of heaven and earth, it asks for no special privileges in lands where other religions are powerfully established. The “most paganish, Jewish, Turkish, or anti-Christian consciences” are only to be fought against with the “Sword of God’s Spirit,” and there must be freedom for all, both to preach and to persuade.

Respect for the inner integrity of the other person and his rights of honest thought, and a concern for his spiritual growth are fundamental to the Christian religion. Christianity cannot deny to other faiths what it desires for itself in the field of liberty. It must be on its guard lest any

¹⁰ Quoted by Jordan, *op. cit.* Vol. ii, p. 40.

¹¹ Quoted by Bates, *op. cit.*, p. 427.

doctrine of absolutes in ecclesiastical decisions, or in the formulation of dogma, should stultify the workings of conscience or deal harshly with the genuinely disturbed mind.

Christianity can best display its belief in freedom and show itself a worthy keeper of it by humility in holding the truth, and being the challenger of oppression, civil and ecclesiastical. Only in ways like these can Mandell Creighton's judgment be sustained that liberty "is always unsafe in the world and is only secure under the guardianship of the Church; for the Church possesses the knowledge of man's eternal destiny —which alone can justify his claim to freedom."

A Review of the Quarter's Fiction

JOHN C. SCHROEDER

NOVELISTS, in our day, are not inclined to turn to the ministry as a field for their art. But recently two stories about ministers have appeared, *No Trumpet Before Him* and *The Bishop's Mantle*, both of which indicate an intimate knowledge of the parson's life and both of which portray him as a significant person in contemporary society. There is considerable similarity in the two stories. Each of these men is young; each has a wife who does not understand what her husband is about and unwittingly betrays him; each gets involved in a slum-clearance project which brings upon him the enmity of a leading member of his church; and each is portrayed as a sympathetic and wise counselor of the young people of his parish.

No Trumpet Before Him is the story of a young, gauche, truly religious Methodist minister whose bishop, a wise man of great insight, appoints him to a prosperous church in a university town. Paul Phillips' wife is elated at the opportunity to move from their drab little parsonage to a large house where the amenities and sophistications are given scope. She is not religious enough nor mature enough to understand what it will mean to keep one's spiritual integrity clean in the midst of the subtler temptations of middle-class respectability. But her husband, fortified by a militant faith, is quick to perceive the shams and complacencies which cover the anxieties and insecurities of so many apparently successful people. He is soon aware of both the overt and covert opposition of his people and knows that he has no support except that of the bishop and his wife and a mature professor of English. The time comes, however, when young people, confused and disturbed by a variety of things, come to him for counsel. In the meantime, the snobs and the Babbitts work for his removal. A climax comes when he preaches a sermon denouncing the conditions in a slum, which is owned by an aristocratic spinster of his parish.

The Bishop's Mantle tells a comparable story. Hilary Laurens, a bishop's grandson, is called to a wealthy metropolitan Episcopal Church. He is in love with a gay, charming young pagan, Lex McColly, who is reluctant to marry him because it will curtail her freedom. Hilary soon is plunged into the variety of demands which come to the minister of a city church. The lonesome, the cynical, the poor, the bereaved, the wist-

ful, the seekers, all turn to him for answers to their many anxieties. This story also reaches a climax when Hilary discovers that a miserable tenement near St. Matthew's is owned by his senior vestryman.

Both stories have a "happy ending," in that in each of them the people of good conscience recognize the justice behind their young minister's crusade. People who do not know the details of the parson's life will be startled to learn that he works hard, and that his role in a community is a significant one. They will recognize, too, that a truly religious man always proves to be a bulwark for the many distracted and worried people of our age who, with nothing to believe in, are lost sheep. And they probably will see that religion's ancient marriage with social justice has not been dissolved. These are good stories and, though a little sentimental, are honest portrayals of what happens in many a parish.

Whether people have become so frightened by the present that they retreat into the past, to find their victories vicariously through the victories of their forebears, or whether they examine the past in order the better to understand themselves, the number of historical novels is clearly an index of our preoccupation with other periods.

Proud Destiny is the story of Benjamin Franklin in France, seeking financial support for the American Revolution. The unsung hero of this valuable aid was Beaumarchais, the author of *The Barber of Seville*. He was not only a wit and a fop, but an entrepreneur of great sagacity. Beaumarchais, having raised a great deal of money for the rebellious colonies, sought the support of the French government. The childish Marie Antoinette was captivated by Franklin's charm. Her brother, Joseph, condemned her flippancy and had wisdom enough to understand that the success of the revolution jeopardized the divine right of monarchy. The pathetic Louis XVI, awkward and ugly, also understood what was implicit in the success of Franklin's mission, however slow his mind may have been. But he also hated England.

Great turning points in history sometimes come about as the result of trivialities. Louis granted the credit of twenty-five million livres in a moment of pique. Actually he understood, better than did many of his fatuous courtiers who made a social lion of Franklin, the dangers which American success would pose to his regime. *Proud Destiny* is good historical writing. These people made history, and they come alive again in the pages of Feuchtwanger's book.

Mark Aldanov left Russia in 1919. He is still fascinated by the subject of revolution. *Before the Deluge* is a story of Russia during the

reign of Alexander II, a czar far more amiable and kind than his predecessors. He liberated the peasants only to be rewarded by an assassin's bomb. He was decent enough to frighten the cynical Bismarck. He understood "that in a peaceful and quiet world, men like Bismarck would have nothing to do." He could not quite comprehend the wily Disraeli, and a moralistic Gladstone was an enigma to him. Aldanov tells his story around the life of Mamontov, a dreamer and idealist, who is too dilettante to act. Through Mamontov the reader is introduced to the revolutionaries of the period—Bakunin, Marx, and Elizabeth Mouraviev.

The thesis of the book is that revolutionists are too impatient to wait for revolutions. Consequently they goad history but it does not always go in the direction they intend. If Alexander had not been assassinated, his liberation of the peasants might have started Russia down the road toward democracy.

Before the Deluge gives the reader an interesting insight into life in Russia from 1871 to 1881, when its intellectuals were trying to understand what the rest of Europe was thinking about. Through the long years of Western civilization its people have always been estranged behind an Iron Curtain. Occasionally they have sought to penetrate it. Our own time sees them coming from behind it, to make the whole world restless.

House Divided is a Civil War story so long that I was forced, as judiciously as possible, to skip through its 1,500 pages. I read enough to enjoy the various members of the aristocratic southern Curran family, whose father is identified as the unknown grandfather of Abraham Lincoln. The family has all kinds of people in it from thoughtful heroes to cheap scalawags. Mr. Williams has undoubtedly gone to great pains in his research, seeking the economic and social forces which led to the Confederacy's collapse. He presents the many complex elements in the agricultural civilization which sensed its doom even before the war gave it the coup de grace.

The Ring and the Cross is the analysis of the industrial life of a Texas city, presumably Houston, during the war. The city has grown with the rise to power of Senator Adam Denbow. The major protagonists in the industrial conflict are Vaiden MacEachern, a thoughtful, philosophic aristocrat, and Wesley Clayton, a brilliant, wealthy, horrible fascist. The plot of the book is turgid and the two dominant characters are utterly unreal. This is left-wing literature. The villain is utterly vicious and just as incomprehensible. The hero is much more human,

although he, too, is a convenient peg upon whom the author hangs his ideas.

No one can doubt that there was dreadful corruption in our economic life as the country boomed in war production. We Americans have become so used to the sordid tale that we have become cynical toward the revelations of greed. But the answer cannot be found in the easy ideological oversimplifications which the book presents. Undoubtedly the essence of the struggle is that between reasonableness and violence; but the fact is that both qualities can be found on both sides.

Crescent City is a highly disillusioning book even though its hero is a noble man. This is the tale of a city on the Ohio River in southern Indiana during this century. While it is telling the life story of Stephen Holt, a journalist, who is going home to his father's funeral, it is also telling the story of the father's life which was identified with the life of the growing town. His father had run a newspaper which had been crushed by the Ku Klux Klan.

This is a lurid and horrible tale. In it are a lynching, rapes, murders, arson, political corruption, shoddy immorality, and some fine human dignity and courage. I wonder whether an American town can be as bad as that. One can be grateful that there have always been in such towns people as decent and as brave as Jay Holt. Our noses have to be rubbed into the fetid horror of the Negro quarters of our cities and we cannot close our eyes to the cheap immoralities and cruel political corruptions of urban life. Jay Holt was not afraid to face them. The sad thing is that while his son adored him, he did not follow him.

The Heretics consists of two parallel stories. In Provence from 1197 to 1212 the church was persecuting the Albigensians for heresy. Among the victims are three children—Elizabeth, Paul, and Simon. When their parents are tortured to death, the children become criminal outlaws. They pick up Moro, a Moor, under whose leadership they vandalize the city. Eventually they are caught in the Children's Crusade and are lost when they are sold as slaves in Alexandria.

In our own time, three English students with the same names meet a Spanish officer named Cordova during the Spanish Civil War. They, too, become the victims of an Inquisition. This time, it is a political rather than a religious one; but it is equally implacable. Simon, who betrays his friend Paul, makes his case. "One should be able to behave rationally about historically important things. Personal feelings could not be allowed to interfere with the practical consequences of one's general

convictions, otherwise policies would be determined not by political principles but by the accidents of innumerable little individual emotions and peculiarities."

Heretics is superbly written. It reveals the deadly parallel between the church which will drive all into heaven or kill them in the process and communism which will drive all into an earthly paradise or liquidate them in the process. There is no room for nonconformists.

When the Mountain Fell is a lovely little idyll. It sings of man who seems to be crushed by an indifferent universe; but his sanity is saved only because love pursues him. This short story is beautifully written. Its solace is genuine and its impact true.

No Trumpet Before Him. By NELIA GARDNER WHITE. Philadelphia: The Curtis Publishing Company. *The Saturday Evening Post*. Issues of November 8, 15, and 22.

The Bishop's Mantle. By AGNES SLIGH TURNBULL. New York: The Macmillan Company. pp. 359. \$3.00.

Proud Destiny. By LION FEUCHTWANGER. New York: The Viking Press. pp. 625. \$3.50.

The Deluge. By MARK ALDANOV. Translated by Catherine Routsky. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. pp. 561. \$3.50.

House Divided. By BEN AMES WILLIAMS. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Co. pp. 1,514. \$5.00.

The Ring and the Cross. By ROBERT RYLEE. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. pp. 308. \$3.00.

Crescent City. By WILLIAM E. WILSON. New York: Simon and Schuster. pp. 369. \$3.00.

The Heretics. By HUMPHREY SLATER. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co. pp. 210. \$2.75.

When the Mountain Fell. By CHARLES-FERNAND RAMUZ. New York: Pantheon Books. pp. 221. \$2.50.

Book Reviews

Christianity Today. Edited by HENRY SMITH LEIPER. New York: The Morehouse-Gorham Company, 1947. pp. 452. \$5.00.

Henry Smith Leiper has rendered us a great service in the book, *Christianity Today*, of which he is editor. It is the only book of its kind. It is a survey of the state of the churches in every important area of the world. Forty-two Christian leaders tell us about the non-Roman churches in forty-two countries. One can hardly read the book without being tremendously moved. It gives hope and despair, joy and pain, prophecy and challenge.

For example, it is almost heartbreaking to read of the tough times through which the non-Roman churches of Spain have passed, to note the decline of church-going in the British Isles, and to learn of the collapse of moral standards in practically every area of the world. The aftermath of the war has brought juvenile delinquency, increase in venereal diseases, divorce, and sex indulgence. One notes the increasing materialism in the West Indies and the interest of the church in world affairs in Australia. We get a glimpse of what the church must do to adjust itself to a free India, and how few people worship at all in New Zealand. One's heart is made glad when we can get an authoritative statement of the status of the church in Russia with proof that the church is no longer being crushed in that country. It is not so encouraging to note what the author of the chapter on Italy has to say about the lot of the people of the Protestant churches in that country. Adolphe Keller gives a hopeful picture of how the churches of Switzerland resisted morally the wave of paganism resulting from the rise of totalitarian states. The weakness of the churches of Poland calls for prayer and material assistance.

The church situation in Germany is not too helpful. The chapter on Finland shows how many returned from the war bewildered and disappointed and how drinking and immorality increased. In the Near East the churches are going through a crisis. "On one side are the ideals of our democratic, Christian world. On the other side is communism. As the Christians have favored the Jews, become agnostic because of modern scientific thought, and cast away their Old World tradition in a desire for European modes, they are not trusted or respected. On the other hand, communism is making great strides and exerting an ever-increasing influence." The Moslem faith is a strong competitor in the Holy Land. The Christian churches of China have survived but they have many scars. Church properties were damaged. Church hospitals and schools have lost their libraries and equipment. Membership in the Japanese Christian churches dropped to about one half during the war but is now on the upgrade.

As for the United States, Walter Horton feels that the American churches are more unified and more ecumenical than before the war; they have more group leadership; the churches are more biblical and doctrinal, less emotional and activistic, and are facing a more radically secularized and perilous situation.

I have given a few inadequate descriptions and interpretations of what several of the authors have said. By way of summary these impressions stand out.

1. The church will survive the present crisis as it has survived all past crises. Past persecutions did not kill the Christian church; and when and if mod-

ern civilizations collapse, the Christian church will carry on as was the case when Rome fell. Though badly bruised, the church has great vitality in almost every area.

2. The ecumenical movement is felt throughout the world. This is perhaps the most significant trend to be found in the book.

3. In some areas church co-operation is a hopeful sign such as that of the Catholic and Protestant churches in Hungary.

4. Despite its vitality, there is little hope that the church will have any great influence in building the Europe or Asia of tomorrow. Churches are too weak greatly to perfect or guide social and economic changes.

5. The book is a challenge to the Christians of America. I get the impression that little food and starvation will probably make great spiritual growth impossible both in Europe and Asia. As materialism and communism spread, it is all the more urgent that we Christians in America sacrifice to the limit to make the churches of the war areas strong and vital.

[*Note:* Dr. Leiper has requested the correction of an error in translation on p. 95, discovered in the first printing of the book and omitted from later printings. A statement is attributed to the late Cardinal Gibbons which was actually made by Orts Gonzales to the Cardinal. It therefore is without significance as representing Roman Catholic views of the church in Spain.]

BENJAMIN E. MAYS

President, Morehouse College, Atlanta, Georgia.

Racism: A World Issue. By EDMUND D. SOPER. New York: The Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1947. pp. 304. \$2.50.

The writer faced the task of reviewing this book with some misgiving. It arose out of his knowledge that no Jew had part in the Seminars of 1942-44, preparatory and subsequent to the conference on "Christian Bases of World Order" at Delaware, Ohio, in 1943, out of which grew the reports included in the volume. A careful reading of its pages disclosed, however, that Dr. Soper had been equal to a most exacting task. The issue is clearly stated. World-wide facts are carefully weighed, and the concluding chapters are a fine summary of the religious obligations which grow out of the living issue of racism everywhere.

Apart from a careful utilization of the facts, the author chose his authorities well, and his citations are admirable. Thus, Ruth Benedict's word: "Heredity takes no notice of the glories of civilization, whether they are in science or in technology or in art; these can be perpetuated in any group, not by nature but by nurture." Professor Redfield's comment is likewise illuminating: "In the troubled affairs of men race is of consequence because of what men think and feel about it and not because of anything that race is of itself."

The volume is built upon the truth that racism is a modern superstition, a dogma of comparatively recent origin—"man's most dangerous myth." Professor Soper states his purpose in these succinct terms: "The main purpose of this volume is to present racism as a world problem, not confined to any one nation, or even to two or three, but a problem making itself felt in every continent and among all major ethnic groups. The plan is to make a survey of the world, picking out the places where the racial conflict is most keenly felt, discovering, if possible, the peculiar nature of the tension in each locality, and determining the seriousness

of the issues and what is being done to relieve the condition. . . . It may be that by the time this study has been carried to the end it will be realized that the race problem is one of the world's most important and serious issues—one that in one way or another involves all others—and that without its solution there is no assurance that peace among the nations or harmony within nations will prevail." The present writer ventures to believe that this purpose is fully carried out.

In Chapter IV the author deals cogently with the Nazi dogma of the "master race"—"All that is not race in this world is trash." One cannot help lamenting that Christendom had to wait until 1947 to hear nazism or Hitlerism characterized in moral terms, as Soper says: "Hitler runs counter, either through ignorance or sheer perversity, to the findings of all modern scientific investigators. But this attitude is reprehensible on a more severe count. Suppose it were true that races were inherently superior and inferior; the attitude of those who consider themselves superior need not be Hitler's. It would not be necessary for them to despise and hate and maltreat those who cannot help being inferior. . . ." In this chapter the author also sees fit to deal with "Jewish separatism," without however a wholly generous appreciation of the fact that so-called separatism, to quote his own words, "desires to preserve its identity."

Entirely objective is his handling of "Russia: many peoples, one nation," which includes his statement: "The Soviet Union has learned to deal with the problem of minority groups more successfully than any other nation," as based upon the Soviet Constitution of 1936. Upon this Soper wisely comments: "Racism, the assumption of inherent superiority of one group over another, was officially banned by governmental action. It lost its significance with the disappearance of privilege."

Perhaps the finest, certainly the most important chapter is that which deals with racial minorities in the United States. He quotes with approval the word of Conrad Hoffman: "What the church in America does in regard to the Jews in America will probably be decisive, humanly speaking, in determining the future of world Jewry." "Even if the Jews were perfect, anti-Semitism would probably continue. Whereas originally this prejudice was largely rooted in a religious question, today social, economic, national, and racial factors are the dominant causes of this anti-Jewish attitude."

One wishes that Dr. Soper might have qualified his observation: "The Jews have the reputation of being not overscrupulous in business transactions, and of edging in at every opportunity to gain an advantage over their Gentile (or Jewish) competitors." On the other hand, if this observation sounds harsh and harmful to a deeply loyal Jew, Soper is fair enough to conclude his chapter on racial minorities with this finely understanding paragraph: "Few communities can be found in our land where there is a considerable Jewish group in which some names do not stand out as leaders of distinction and genuine worth. . . . When a Gentile is willing to break through his initial prejudices and become friendly with Jews, he has a happy surprise. He discovers that there is a significant group of Jews whom he can count on to be his trusted friends, men who have many of the ideals he cherishes and will go the full distance in building up attitudes of understanding and mutual helpfulness. There is no step more needed than this in combating anti-Semitism. . . . The way is by understanding and friendly

concern each for the other, to be exercised in season and out of season, no matter how great the opposition or from what source it comes."

His chapter on American life is especially fair, and concludes with the words: "Gunnar Myrdal calls his work 'An American Dilemma.' What creates the dilemma? Just this, that we Americans, all of us, have sworn wholehearted allegiance to the American creed that 'all men were created free and equal' and should have equal rights and opportunities: *and we do not live up to it.* . . . There is only one way out, and today is our day of opportunity. We can prove to the world, which is watching us with both eyes wide open, that we are sincere and mean what we say when we lose no occasion to publish abroad our belief in man as man and in his essential dignity as one created by the one God, who is over all, black as well as white. . . ." These words state the "greatest American issue" with utmost frankness and fairness.

The closing chapters summarize well the problem of racism, despite one passing strange reference to the "striking and long-continued conflicts between Jews and Arabs"—as if these two Semitic peoples were racially divided. True it is that it required courage, vision, and rare understanding for one emerging out of a missionary environment to say: "No power in the world can prevent the colored races, the peoples of Asia and Africa, from uniting because of common grievances against centuries of domination by the use of means we have taught them so well to use. The policy of exclusion on account of race, unfair advantage taken of peoples who are just emerging from their backwardness, and above all exploitation in all its forms must be consigned to the limbo to which we have relegated the rack, the thumbscrew, and burning at the stake." Edwin R. Embree issues the solemn warning: 'Unless the Christian church conquers the segregation which it has allowed itself to fall into, it must lose its leadership in the spiritual and social life of America.'

RABBI STEPHEN S. WISE

Free Synagogue, New York City.

The Questing Spirit: Religion in the Literature of Our Time. Selected and edited by HALFORD E. LUCCOCK and FRANCES BRENTANO. New York: Coward-McCann, Inc., 1947. pp. 717. \$5.00.

"It is usually through artistic expression that the highest values acquire permanent significance and the force which moves mankind. Art has a limitless power of converting the human soul . . . for art alone possesses the two essentials of educational influence—universal significance and immediate appeal." (Werner Jaeger in *Paideia*.)

There is much in the 700 pages of this anthology of both universal significance and immediate appeal. The editors have thoroughly searched British and American writing of the last forty-seven years, and have brought us a diverse and interesting collection. Some will be surprised to find how much good writing upon religious themes these irreligious times have produced. They have not been, as Editor Luccock points out in his introduction, times propitious for expressions of religious faith. But here in poetry and prose are affirmations, examples, fancies, and experiences which revolve about the central relationship of God and man. Two principles have guided selection, the editors state; the subject must be religion

and the form must be good literature. It is possible that the first is more easily recognizable than the second; it is certain that though all the selections in one way or another fulfill the first requirement, not all fulfill the second. One feels occasionally among these pages that a thinner book would have been a better one.

The editors have been wise in including expressions of doubt and denial as well as affirmations of faith. These help to make the book sturdy and varied; here is life in true colors, not the monotone of lavender which some religious anthologies suggest.

The introduction gives an excellent survey of the religious climate in American and British writing since 1900. The prefaces to the several sections develop this further in each field; perhaps it would have been better to include all this material in the main introduction. To some extent the prefaces are superfluous. An anthologist, like a good cook, should stand back when the table is set. Tastes differ; and there is no use in turning us against a dish by telling us the editor "loves" it.

The first section, Short Stories, is perhaps the most interesting of the book. Many of the selections are not short stories proper, but chapters from well-known novels, and they present a great diversity of pictures. Religious experience comes at times in strange forms, and many of these imaginative accounts are touching and ennobling.

The poetry section must have been difficult to make; religious poetry that is both truly religious and truly poetry is scarce. It is here one feels the editors should have been a little more severe; it is the only part of the book where softness and sentimentalism occasionally appear. But there is wonderful stuff here, too, some under well-known names, and some under those not so well known which we are grateful to have brought into currency.

Modern drama is not always compelling in print, and some of the selections of plays suffer for this reason. But there are memorable scenes which are good reading, such as those from *The Green Pastures*, *The Zeal of Thy House*, and the short play, *Brother Sun*, by Laurence Housman.

The last section, called Affirmation, is a collection of brief passages divided under the subheadings: The Search for God, Faith, Whither Mankind, Jesus, Prayer and Worship, Personal Religion, Social Religion, Science and Religion, War and Peace, and Eternal Life. It is a treasure house of quotations on these subjects; and it provides a very fair if cursory picture of contemporary thought upon them. It is not especially good reading, for in most cases the selections are too short; the jacket refers to them as "capsules of wisdom." But the editors have made available here some extremely valuable material, which would make the book worth while even if it stood alone.

Today, when the dark and the abyss are not backward but forward:

"There is need of words in the affirmative
Of ringing words not in command but hope."

Present-day writing provides too much that is fake, picayune, ignoble. But this anthology shows us that there is also writing with the universal significance and immediate appeal which denotes value both for today and tomorrow.

JOSEPHINE YOUNG CASE

Colgate University, Hamilton, New York.

The World's Great Madonnas. By CYNTHIA PEARL MAUS. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1947. pp. vii-789. \$4.95.

This elaborate and handsome volume is, as the cover informs one, an anthology of "world-famous pictures, poetry, music, and stories covering six continents and twenty-five countries," and is a companion piece to Miss Maus's previous anthology, *Christ and the Fine Arts*. There are 114 full-page art reproductions, 114 art interpretations, 239 poems, sixty stories, sixty-two hymns, carols, lullabies, and folk songs with interpretations. These interpretations are, in the main, clear and sensitive, managing to convey and explain the atmosphere of the selection in a rather remarkably concise yet adequate manner.

One may read, and look at, the book from several different viewpoints, none of which need prove disappointing. It is rewarding for the pure enjoyment it offers of picture, song, and story. The student interested in the artistic efforts which the tender and appealing figure of the Virgin Mother has inspired down through the ages, will find in it a vast amount of information. It is a richly supplied source book for the teacher or the mother. Doubtless Miss Maus had in mind all these purposes, as well as some others, in the compilation; but the binding theme and the important central motive is, one feels, contained in the dedication: "Dedicated to International and Interracial Understanding and Good Will." In smaller type there follows the explanation: "If you would understand a people, look at them through the eyes of the poet, the musician, and the artist."

When you have felt the heart of a people, as expressed in the most poignantly tender sentiments human hearts know, Miss Maus seems to say, you can never think of that people again with the same alloy of distrust or antagonism. No emotion is, of course, tenderer or more poignant than that which the human race in general feels for motherhood and childhood. Add to this sentiment the tinge of religious veneration, and you probably come near to getting an expression of the human heart at its best in these pictures, songs, and stories, which Miss Maus has selected.

If there are a few which one wishes had been omitted, it would be, after all, unprofitable to choose those few for detailed mention. (Notably the reviewer felt she might have done, for instance, without Miss Sangster's tale of the Cruel Matron and the Littlest Orphan. Cruel matrons, like cruel stepmothers, are less numerous than they are supposed to be.) But in the genuine wealth of material presented, so little of this slightly cheapening variety has been included, and there is besides such a great field for choice, that more than a passing observation along this line would be hypercritical.

HELEN CHAPPELL WHITE

Emory University, Emory University, Georgia.

These Words Upon Thy Heart. By HOWARD TILLMAN KUIST. Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1947. pp. 189. \$2.50.

Journey Through the Bible. By WALTER FERGUSON. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1947. pp. xi-364. \$3.50.

These two books afford an excellent introduction for teachers or readers wishing to approach the Bible as fascinating literature. Howard Tillman Kuist is professor "for the teaching of the English Bible" in Princeton Theological Sem-

inary, and Walter Ferguson is professor of English in Temple University. Would that more teachers of English and theological professors could subordinate dogma to the attraction of the Bible as a book of living literature! It is apparent that both these writers have a conservative background, but they are writing for young people and δι πολλοι. So prevalent is the ignorance of what the Bible really is as a collection of most vivid and inspiring writing that it is a welcome sign when teachers, either conservative or liberal, present it as such.

Dr. Kuist announces his faith at once by defining Holy Scripture as "What Christians have recognized as the revealed will of God," but he immediately follows by showing that the familiar forms of literature in which this truth is cast must be understood as any literature is understood. The difference, he says, is in its unique illuminating power which places it upon a higher level than secular literature. His purpose is to stimulate an appreciation of "the principles and disciplines of artistic expression" in order that the reader may be more sensitive to biblical truth.

He points out two types of experience, creation and re-creation. Literature to be appreciated must be re-created. There is a difference between historical and re-creative study. Scripture becomes alive only when observation, induction, and deduction are so continuously employed that they bring insight to the original vital message embodied in the literature. There is a whole chapter on observation and our superficial use of it. Moral requirements are necessary as well as intellectual; intuition and a "disciplined sensitivity." Several pages are devoted to the laws of composition, and half of the book to these preliminary discussions. Then attention is centered upon the Bible as literature, under the topics first of form, second, freedom to think or the influence of ideas on character, which result in commitment to those ideas. This book is *about* the Bible and the way to approach it, rather than a study of the text itself and a "re-creative" presentation.

The *Journey Through the Bible* is a truly re-creative presentation of the text. It would not satisfy modern textual critics in all particulars; it is done not for their satisfaction but rather to stimulate the common person to read and study this classic as most rewarding. The author has read widely and used his imagination in restoring a thrilling background to the biblical stories, prophecies, and personalities. He has omitted some very telling episodes and has used now and again a conservative literalism rather than a more plausible symbolic interpretation. But he is very humble in his acknowledgment of partial knowledge and the realization that "Bible reading is the enterprise of a lifetime." He is a born teacher in the way he disarms the reader, whether conservative or liberal, by starting with a recital of the story as written and then often ending with a modern query as to its literalness. For example, he tells the resurrection story quite literally but closes with the question, "Was this a physical or purely a mystical experience? Who knows?"

Also when discussing miracles, at first he puts the skeptic in his place, but stresses the *spiritual* power of Jesus however the stories come down to us, favoring the symbolic meaning of the feeding of the five thousand and walking on the water. And in the section on Revelation he says, "from the point of view of symbolism the book contains some of the most fascinating material in literature."

His style is very popular and modern. The effect is much like turning on the radio and listening to David and Goliath as a "sports final" or to Isaiah the

st. biman on the Town Meeting of the Air. He often fills in the background with his own dramatic imagination, as do modern writers of historical novels. However, as a rule he is very true to the actual historical setting. We do not know that "Jesus' eyes were now bloodshot," but that is none too vivid a presentation of the stress and strain upon physical endurance. His pictures of the prophets are the best part of the book and very well done. One could wish he had done the Psalms as well, had not slighted the dramatic effect of the prelude of Job and the Vineyard Song of Isaiah, had pointed out the great crisis in Elijah's life in discovering that the small inner voice of conscience was more divine than Nature, and had explained more clearly that the moral and economic standards of the Old Testament were not the same as those of today.

In presenting the New Testament he definitely says that he is writing for the layman who often gets "all mixed up in his poor head" about the synoptic problem and "forgets what comes from what." He is rather confused himself on certain points, such as the authorship of the Fourth Gospel, but says, "Whoever the author is, he is seeking only the inner truth revealed through Jesus." He assumes that the Sermon on the Mount was one discourse and that Luke was the writer of the whole of Acts. But notwithstanding certain gaps and confusions from a strictly scholarly point of view, he emphasizes the essential truths and brings out the setting and the personalities so vividly that no reader can fail to be interested and want to know more of the Bible.

LAURA H. WILD

Professor emeritus, Mount Holyoke College; Claremont, California.

Youth After Conflict. By GOODWIN WATSON. New York: Association Press, 1947. pp. xv-300. \$4.00.

Are changes in youth's attitudes directly produced by war? Or do wars act as catalytic agents for social, economic, and religious tendencies operative antecedent to war? Or, again, do wars have little or no effect upon such tendencies?

Mr. Watson's conclusions tend to agree with the sentiment implied by the last two questions. Although no one pattern of cause and effect accounts for the development of specific social currents, for the most part he sees wars functioning either as occasional causes or as almost irrelevant parallel events to social movements. On the basis of a study of events in the United States after the Civil War and World War I, and in Europe after World War I, the author makes out a reasonably convincing case for the position that wars are not decisive originating causes of social tendencies among youth (cf. e.g., p. 127). Dr. William H. Kilpatrick concurs in this opinion when he states in the introduction, "It is not the war which principally influences youth coming to maturity shortly after its close, but rather the general social situation otherwise surrounding youth" (p. vii).

To a great extent, technological changes introduce or release forces in the cultural complex in respect to which war plays a minor role. After the first World War, industrial production, the automobile, the moving pictures, religious education, modern music and art, and religious modernism accelerated in influence. War was not responsible either for the origin or the speedy development of these factors. These lines of "growth would have culminated in the swift advance witnessed in the 1920's, whether there had been a world war or not. The élan of

the postwar period was less a product of the war than a conjunction of these steeply rising growth curves" (p. 194).

On the other hand, the same period reveals a retarding of hitherto advancing trends. Several promising lines fell into regressive phases. Temporary isolationism replaced internationalist sentiment; Red persecution damped socialistic hopes; Ku-Klux-Klanism cut off interracial advances; while gangsterism and political corruption vaulted crime indices to new heights. However, on Mr. Watson's showing, these postwar reversals were not war-caused.

The fundamental dynamics of postwar changes lie in what are vaguely called "social conditions" other than war proper. Thus in the concluding chapters, the reader is treated to some highly interesting samples of crystal-ball gazing into those "social conditions" which will probably affect youth in the 1950's. One hundred selected "sages" from the fields of social science, education, philosophy, religion, science, etc., hazard their opinions on what will happen in respect to research, the economic order, leisure, health, labor, family and sex, arts, and religion. The author's opinions are also mixed with these prophecies, but without specific documentation. The result makes informative reading, but raises doubts concerning the basis of the selection of quotations and authorities.

The book as a whole draws valuable data together from a variety of sources, and a well-rounded picture emerges of what happens to young people after war. However, the impression remains that conclusions often have been reached without sufficient analysis of the fundamental working concepts. The differentiation between "war" and "social conditions" calls for consideration of the extent to which "war" is more than purely a military affair. So much in the conclusion depends upon this clear differentiation between war and other social factors that the author owes us more than a common-sense recognition that "war" is somehow different from other cultural elements. One cannot infer legitimately that war does not "cause" the speeding up or the retardation of trends unless a workable notion of war is made explicit. In a similar way the concept of "youth" becomes a loose-jointed term, including two groups: veterans and young women living in the war period proper, and those young people maturing within ten or twenty years after the war. The indiscriminated incorporation of these two groups in the single category of "youth" sometimes proves unfortunate for the author's findings.

The matter of data selection is sometimes disquieting. The opening chapter on "Youth After the Civil War" depends almost entirely for its factual undergirding upon New York newspapers and reports emanating from that metropolis. Study of journals and available data from the South and West might well have substantially changed the viewpoint of the chapter and might have guaranteed the reader a fuller picture of the post-Civil War era. Certainly the conclusion that the Civil War was only a "minor factor" in the life of Northern youth hangs upon more than what certain New York editors wrote (cf. p. 18)! The documentation of the chapters on European and American youth after World War I and the Rise of Modernism begets greater confidence, but occasional indefinite references and failure to weigh the value of quoted authorities raise doubt at critical points.

Nevertheless, the author's purpose of assailing the *post hoc ergo propter hoc* fallacy as concerns youth's reaction to war is satisfactorily carried through. Not all that happens after war can be blamed upon war. So the youthful flame of the

twenties sputters before the whirlwind of Mr. Watson's quotations. The jere-miads over a generation which seemed lost appear less convincing in retrospect. Many hopes for a better world went a-glimmering after World War I, but the reservoir of potential good was drained by the entrenched powers of adult society quite as much as by the failure of youth itself. And how will youth come out this time? Of course, to this question the book can make no final answer.

CLYDE A. HOLBROOK

Dean, Shove Chapel, Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colorado.

Physicians of the Soul. By CHARLES F. KEMP. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1947. pp. xiv-314. \$2.75.

This book is a timely presentation of the history of pastoral counseling. The interest in psychiatry is reaching new heights—as any analysis of Hollywood's recent productions or of current books and magazines will indicate. Rabbi Liebman's *Peace of Mind* has achieved notable popularity. Clergy and seminarians are showing more and more interest in the contributions of psychiatry to our understanding of human problems, and an increasing number of them are receiving special training with a psychiatric emphasis. It is good to have Mr. Kemp indicate the breadth and depth of the church's interest in the pastoral ministry since the time of Christ, who was himself the great Pastor. Such a study should help the pastor to see his work with individuals in a clearer perspective and to avoid excessive absorption in the psychiatric fads of the moment. Yes, there had been pre-eminently successful pastoral work before the advent of modern psychiatry; and, although the rapid development of the scientific approach to the problems of human personality should greatly increase the pastor's understanding and his effectiveness, there are no doubt many clergy with little knowledge of modern psychiatry who through a real love of people and some good common sense are doing a first-rate job at the "cure of souls."

Mr. Kemp's book traces the history of this aspect of the church's ministry from New Testament times to the present day. He has a section devoted to some allied movements such as revivalism, the social gospel, and the faith-healing cults. He discusses in some detail the important developments outside the church which, in recent times, have given an impetus to the interest in the pastoral aspects of the ministry. He brings the reader up to date on the developments within the church which at the present time are fostering a more fruitful work with individuals. It is at this point that we noted one weakness in this good book. Apparently much of the information on current work in the field was gathered some time before the book was published. This was obvious in his comments concerning the Council for Clinical Training. He says the work of the Council continued to grow until in 1940 seventy-eight students received its training. Actually the Council grew past 1940—up to 1947, the date of this book's publication. There are other spots in this same section of the book which indicate that the author's research needed posting "to date."

One other more serious weakness is the limited amount of space and consideration given to the Catholic tradition of work with individuals. After the second chapter on "The Medieval Period," which ends on page 38, the book is concerned exclusively with Protestant pastoral counseling. One is disappointed that this

book does not even mention such notably wise and effective "physicians of the soul" as St. Francis de Sales and Archbishop Fénelon. Such omissions are serious and mar an otherwise good book.

What especially pleases about this book is the interesting biographical data which is scattered throughout. Instead of relating simply the point of view and the counseling experience of various outstanding pastors, Mr. Kemp tells something of their personal preparation for their work, of the struggles with themselves which preceded their ministry to the inner needs of others. It is interesting to read of the depths of despondency and temptations to suicide of the great American psychologist, William James, or to learn of Phillips Brooks's failure in his ambition to be a teacher, or of the morbid spiritual struggle which characterized the childhood and early youth of Washington Gladden. Great portions of this book are given to fascinating "thumb-nail" sketches of great men. For the preacher in search of homiletical helps this material should prove of great value.

Mr. Kemp has done interestingly and well a timely piece of work.

RALPH D. BONACKER

Senior Chaplain, Bellevue Hospital, New York City.

Conflicts of Power in Modern Culture. A Symposium edited by LYMAN BRYSON, LOUIS FINKELSTEIN, R. M. MACIVER. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1947. pp. xx-703. \$6.50.

The sixty-two papers included in this symposium were prepared for the Seventh Conference on Science, Philosophy, and Religion held in Chicago in September, 1946, and were thoroughly discussed at the various sessions of the gathering. Now they have been edited for publication and presented in printed form.

The Seventh Conference, like its predecessors, developed about a central theme to which it was believed contributions could be made from the whole area of human research and knowledge. The call to the Conference stated the problem tersely:

"The theory underlying the organization of the 1946 Conference is that the culture of a society—using the word culture in its anthropological sense—is an important, if not decisive, factor in the behavior of most of the constituents of the society. This culture is handed down from generation to generation. Its inculcation begins long before the period of conscious education."

"Western culture (aside from the teachings of its religious and some of its philosophical traditions) bears as one of its most characteristic features an emphasis upon the power element. Its most generally accepted standards of success consist of accumulations of material goods, the harnessing of material resources, and the control of political, military, and economic power. The religious and philosophical traditions have produced examples of self-effacement and saintliness, but these are exceptions and not the rule. To date one of the most effective means of energizing the peoples of the West remains the hunger for domination and prestige."

The present volume, composed of the intellectual efforts of sixty-two scholars, contains the replies submitted to the Conference to these questions: "How can we retain the essential advantages of our civilization, including its scientific and material assets, and yet bring the quest for power and the tendency toward aggression under control? Can we reorient men's minds, through influencing their cultural environment from infancy, so that they will find fulfillment in achievement, rather than in the credit and recognition of achievement?"

In their approach to this central theme, the scholars followed different paths. Some directed their attention toward analysis of the nature of culture. Others sought to discover the nature of cultural transmission. Some dealt with Western culture and its nature, and few narrowed this to a detailed consideration of the cultural patterns of the United States. Many attempted to analyze the nature of power. A few contributors challenged the assertion that power and aggressiveness are more predominant in Western culture than in other cultures. These men assert that one will find latent aggressiveness in all social groups, and that in many cultures this aggressiveness has become active and has served as both cultural solidifier and divider. Many of the scholars indicated that they believed the drive for power and the tendencies toward aggressiveness so basic in the make-up of man that it is impossible to eradicate them by cultural and religious conditionings.

Despite disagreements as to the importance of power in Western culture, and even some disagreement about the nature of culture itself, there appears to be almost unanimous agreement that extreme manifestations of power in national and international politics and in the economic and social areas must be checked.

How this is to be done, of course, posed a most perplexing topic. And as one would expect in a symposium of this nature, there are a variety of suggestions. Some of the contributors pin their faith on the development of international law backed by an international police force and a world community. Progressive disarmament, beginning with the most destructive weapons, is the hope of others. Not a few of the sixty-two contributors are skeptical of legal and structural devices and a small number, albeit with little enthusiasm, are inclined to look toward power politics and the creation of a nice balance (or concert) of powers.

Since the great majority of the contributors are teachers, there was expressed a certain amount of confidence in education as a means of control of power and aggressiveness and as a major factor in the achievement of an integrated and peaceful culture. These contributors expressed a faith in the "proper" education. Others pointed out, however, the role played by education in the rise of nationalism and to the use made of it by fanatical leaders in the molding of totalitarian states.

Morality and religion as major factors in the control of power and in the achievement of integration in Western culture received considerable attention. The assumption that these are vital factors in the problem was accepted by nearly all the contributors. Some, however, were not ready to agree that religion has acted to check absolute power. They point out, clearly, that organized religion has frequently become a center of power itself and that religious leaders have been guilty of cruel and ruthless deeds. Some sought a religion freed from institutional aspects, others a greater appreciation of various elements contained in current religious traditions. A few looked toward a new type of world-wide religion that would possess the power to integrate culture on a world-wide basis.

The volume is a valuable one to have—to read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest. Our problems are many and complex and adequate and sound solutions will not come in simplified and single form. The work of these sixty-two scholars represents an honest and well-conceived plan to direct our best thinking into constructive ways. As such, the printed volume is a splendid guide to use as we go on our way through the modern world.

WILLIAM P. SEARS, JR.

New York University, New York City.

An Approach to the Teaching of Jesus. By ERNEST CADMAN COLWELL.
New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1947. pp. 128. \$1.25.

An Introduction to Jesus for the Twentieth Century. By R. W. STEWART.
New York: The Macmillan Company, 1947. pp. 127. \$1.75.

The six chapters of the first book, by the president of the University of Chicago, who is a New Testament scholar of distinction, comprised the Quillian Lectures for 1946 at Emory University. Professedly the volume is an introduction or approach to the teachings of Jesus rather than a comprehensive treatment. Designed primarily for Protestant ministers and laymen, it will prove valuable not only for personal reading and study but also as a guide for adult discussion groups.

The first chapter deals with the radical nature of the style of Jesus' teaching. His language was extreme and extravagant, vigorous, dynamic, and explosive, abounding in hyperboles and paradoxical statements. Although we speak of his teachings, Jesus was more the poet and preacher than the teacher. His teaching is not systematic; moreover, it is fragmentary, in that he did not deal with subjects on which there was general agreement between himself and his Jewish audiences, such as a statement of belief in the one God as the creator and sustainer of the universe or an attack upon idolatry.

Not only was his method radical but so was his message. To be sure, most of his teachings when taken individually may be paralleled in Jewish sources. Not even the so-called Golden Rule nor Jesus' teaching about the fatherhood of God was original with him; both, in fact, had appeared before his time. However, his teaching on the whole was original; the originality is to be found in the structure he built out of the separate religious and ethical teachings of Judaism, and in what he emphasized and made central. Among these emphases which constitute both the core and the originality of Jesus' teaching are the inwardness of religion, God's benevolence and power, humility in personal living, and the primacy of the Kingdom.

Two chapters are devoted to a presentation of the element of humility in Jesus' teaching and life, and its source and meaning. In much of the Gospel record pride is depicted as a vice and humility as a virtue. Jesus severely rebukes the evils of religious pride, of self-righteousness, and self-seeking ambition. On the other hand, he awards the blessings of God to the poor in spirit and to the meek. In one of his own poems which enrich this volume Dr. Colwell writes:

And beauty in labor,
And beauty in laughter,
And beauty in loving
Shall come to the meek.

In keeping with Jesus' teaching it is important to note that he was not greatly interested in telling people what he thought about himself, what he was or who he was, but was dominated with the desire to make known what the will of God was, what God wanted people to do. Accordingly, his own humility was born of his devotion to God, a God of grace and benevolence, but also of might and power.

Jesus placed much of his emphasis upon the proclamation of the Kingdom of God. For Jesus the Kingdom was considered in two tenses, future and present. He believed that it would come, and come soon, and he urged his listeners to do

what they could to be prepared for it and to help bring it into realization. Also, he imperatively told them to do something now, at once. This "something" consisted not only in inward righteousness but also in righteous action within society. Jesus' teaching is difficult and rigorous not because, as some maintain, it is designed as the ethic to be lived in the perfect Kingdom once it is established, but because it accords with the nature of God who wills that men should so live as to be his true sons, here and now.

This volume of lectures, in addition to being thoroughly scholarly, has an excellent literary style which adds to its appeal. Dr. Colwell has provided a most helpful approach to the teachings of Jesus as preserved in the Synoptic Gospels. If the reader will apply to the Gospels themselves the principles of interpretation and appreciation which Dr. Colwell has developed here, he will be guided to a better understanding and appreciation of the teachings of Jesus.

Our second author, pastor of a church in Glasgow, has the laudable purpose of writing for those of the twentieth century who find the approach to Jesus along the traditional lines of faith and doctrine difficult and confusing to follow. In his critique of the traditional and dogmatic Christology of the churches he observes that not only has the historical Jesus been overlaid with the encrustations of the creeds, but that the Gospels themselves represent this same desire to interpret him in the light of faith rather than of history.

The first and longest chapter is an attempt to integrate Jesus into the religious situation of Palestine in his own day. Stewart states, and quite fairly, that Judaism as a religion was not at a dead end, as the traditional view maintains. Instead, it was a dynamic, vital religion possessing a fervent and missionary faith in one righteous God. However, in his reconstruction of Pharisaism the author has not been guided as much as he should have been by authorities like G. F. Moore, Montefiore, Herford, and Finkelstein. He seemingly ignores the emphasis of the Pharisees upon both repentance and the Kingdom of God; states that they were opposed both to messianism and missionary activity; and overlooks the teaching of the Golden Rule by Hillel, an older contemporary of Jesus.

His objective treatment of John the Baptist as the leader of his own prophetic movement, and not merely a predestined forerunner of Jesus, is commendable. He also is correct in calling attention to the high regard which Jesus had for the Baptizer so that his own mission came to be in large measure an outgrowth of John's. But when he assumes that John's message was universal, that his mission transcended national lines and included the world as his parish, he places too much emphasis upon the teaching dubiously attributed to John: "God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham." More than likely the missions of both John and Jesus were largely if not exclusively confined to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.

The message and career of Jesus, so he claims, were centered for the most part upon the realization of the Kingdom of God within himself and his followers, in a furtherance of Jeremiah's teaching of a New Covenant with God written upon the heart of each individual. As for Jesus' own peculiar role, Stewart asserts that he gradually developed a consciousness that in his own person he combined the varying concepts of Messiah, the Suffering Servant, and the Son of Man. Both of these conclusions are highly debatable, as Stewart himself is probably aware.

Contrary to the usual view, Stewart believes that Jesus went to Jerusalem not in fulfillment of some divinely foreordained drama, but that he might proclaim his message concerning the New Covenant at the center of Judaism. His death was brought about by a plot of the Sadducees and Pilate following the cleansing of the Temple, and was a sacrifice only in that it was a self-sacrifice in furtherance of his ideals. He died as a martyr with unbroken faith in God and love to men, thereby validating the New Covenant. Following his sacrificial martyr-death his disciples proclaimed that he was indeed the Messiah, and as the exponent of sacrificial love he indeed became "the Lord of all good life."

In his final chapter Stewart discusses the new philosophy of change and relativity to religion, which is the ever-changing relationship of one spirit to another, human and Divine. Further, he observes that the element of chance in the universe and in human history has been overlooked by traditionalists, particularly by the neo-orthodox. To say, as they do, that "when a certain point in the programme of history was reached the supreme hero emerged and took up his role, is to turn history into drama, and redemption into revelation." Unfortunately, most people prefer drama and revelation to the facts of history.

The book on the whole is stimulating and provocative, and reveals a good deal of insight. On the other hand, it would have been a much better book had the author made a greater use of the findings of the more recent scholarly investigations of the Gospels and the life and teachings of Jesus, as well as of Judaism.

MARTIN RIST

The Iliff School of Theology, Denver, Colorado.

On the Meaning of Christ. Being the William Belden Noble Lectures delivered in Harvard University, 1947, by JOHN KNOX. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1947. pp. 117. \$2.50.

For the establishment of a truly ecumenical theology a Christology which will unite rather than divide is essential. This book is written in an irenic mood, as a contribution toward that important end.

The author begins by pointing out that the history of the church, as well as our personal religious experience, whether we recognize it or not, leads back ineluctably to Jesus Christ; and that fact, though it is hard for some moderns to admit, involves the acceptance of a historic revelation of God in Christ.

The Christian community's experience of Jesus Christ, however, "appears under no fewer than three aspects: (1) as the event or closely knit series of events in and through which God made himself known; (2) as the person who was the center of that event or complex of events; and (3) as the community which both came into existence with the event and provided the locus of it." Some may object to the statement that sometimes the word "Christ" signifies or means the event, sometimes the person, and sometimes the community. Dr. Knox is on surer ground, on unassailable ground, when he indicates that the revelation of God in Christ *involves* event, person, and community, and that sometimes primary emphasis is on one and sometimes on another.

The author insists that when we are seeking to define the meaning of the revelation of God in Christ, "event," which includes the other two, is the more

appropriate and adequate category. This event is not a single happening, "but a cluster of inseparable and mutually interdependent elements which might be summed up in the words, 'Jesus and all that happened in connection with him.' It was through this event as a whole, rather than through anything outside of it or any elements or combination of elements within it, that the revelation which is the source of what is most distinctive and precious in our own spiritual life took place."

Dr. Knox proceeds to point out that the recognition that it was through the event as a whole that God made himself known has at least three practical consequences, each of which is discussed at some length: (1) It relieves us from excessive preoccupation with the insoluble and divisive problem of the "nature" of Christ; (2) it frees us from a certain immoderate anxiety about the "historicity" of the Gospels; and (3) it places the miracles of the New Testament in true perspective. Dr. Knox draws a clear distinction here between the resurrection, which is an essential part of the event, and for which no naturalistic or purely psychological explanation is adequate, and other miraculous incidents which are recorded in the Gospels and which he himself is inclined to question.

In the closing chapters the author discusses (1) the relationship between the event and the story which grew up about the event, and which includes such elements as God's sending the pre-existent Christ to earth, the ascension of Christ and his coming again to judge the quick and the dead; and (2) the relationship between the event and the church, which is seen as the bearer, however unworthy, of a unique and indispensable revelation.

This book, the third of a trilogy of independent works on the meaning of Christ, is a small book, but juicy, and full of strong, red meat. It has a message for both fundamentalist and modernist; it presents in fact a via media which both might travel together, in mutual understanding, if not in full agreement. Actually it is likely to appeal more to the latter than to the former; most of all, perhaps, to the evangelical liberal who wishes to conserve the values of both liberalism and conservatism, modernism and traditionalism.

ERNEST TRICE THOMPSON

Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Virginia.

The Protestant Pulpit. Compiled by ANDREW W. BLACKWOOD. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1947. \$2.75.

Professor Andrew W. Blackwood offers here thirty-nine specimens of preaching for laboratory examination. They range from classics such as Luther's "Justification by Faith," Wesley's "The Scripture Way of Salvation," Chalmers' "The Expulsive Power of a New Affection," and Bushnell's "Every Man's Life a Plan of God" to the work of modern masters like Buttrick, Fosdick, Macartney, Scherer, Sockman, and Weatherhead. The compiler hopes that both seminarians and parish ministers needing a "refresher" in the preaching art, as well as laymen who seek understanding of Protestantism, may glean instruction from firsthand study. To that end he enumerates the paragraphs of the text, appends a topical work sheet, and supplies a bibliography.

The anthologist's aim is admirable. We are rapidly coming to see in all realms that true education is impossible—to use Whitehead's phrase—apart from

"the habitual vision of greatness." We learn best through right example. Professor Blackwood has taken the method of collateral reading selections so successful in teaching English rhetoric and applied it to homiletics. (Perhaps it is wrong to cavil at an anthologist's choices; but why, in a book designed to impart good preaching form, are some of our best teachers—as well as exemplars—of it left out, like Dean Brown of Yale, Dean Gilkey of Chicago, and Dean Hough of Drew? Why, too, is Dr. Fosdick, the leading protagonist of problem preaching, represented by a theological discourse on forgiveness?)

Good preaching is both timeless and timely. It moves about two foci: the eternal gospel and a current need. It is both true in content and persuasive in form. Half the sermons—those by "the masters of other days"—are better expositions of Christian truth than examples of effective strategy. Take the sermon with which the volume begins, Luther's famous discourse on Justification by Faith. It is solid dogma, developed article by article, buttressing itself by Scripture with scarcely a reference to experience. Historically it is a landmark, but hardly instructive in preaching method for modern Americans, unless negatively—how not to do it! The sermons by "the masters of our own day" come much nearer to hitting the human target, though the missile, theologically speaking, is considerably lighter. The ideal for us is to preach the gospel of Luther and Wesley in the idiom of Fosdick and Sockman. Here in one volume, though not always in the same sermon, is abundant vision of both historic Christian doctrine and effective contemporary appeal.

FRANCIS GERALD ENSLEY

North Broadway Methodist Church, Columbus, Ohio.

Theology and Sanity. By F. J. SHEED. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1946.
pp. 407. \$3.00.

If any reader wishes to have a compact and readable account of the way the Roman Catholic faith and point of view appears to a highly intelligent layman, he cannot do better than obtain this book by Mr. Sheed. Already well known as a popular writer on theological subjects, the author attempts in this volume to give a fuller and more "apologetic" statement of his Church's "way" of holding the Christian faith; he succeeds admirably in accomplishing his purpose. Whether or not what he says will commend itself to the reader will depend upon many other considerations—not least, upon his ability to accept the somewhat confident trust that Mr. Sheed places in the official claim of Rome to speak with infallible authority on the nature and meaning of Christianity.

It is, of course, obvious that there must be wide differences between Mr. Sheed and even the most catholically minded of his non-Roman readers. To the reviewer, for example, the discussion of the papacy seems both too easygoing and too severe: the former because the author wishes to commend the Roman claims, the latter because he is quite unrelentingly an ultramontanist. But for the non-Roman reader the point is not whether one agrees or disagrees, but that here is a useful and fairly precise statement of the Roman position. And we need such, since there is an appalling ignorance of Roman teaching amongst our intelligent laity and even amongst many of the clergy. Before we criticize, we ought to understand something of what we criticize.

The earlier chapters, which deal with natural theology, are more likely

to appeal to us of the non-Roman obedience than the latter chapters, where uncritical use of Holy Scripture after the usual Roman fashion, somewhat ingenuous—and often ingenious—special pleading and clever circumlocution, and an evasion (as it seems to the reviewer) of the *real* problems behind some *apparent* problems, mar the discussion.

On one major matter, however, Mr. Sheed is surely entirely correct. Religion must appeal to our heads as well as our hearts; it is a matter of sanity as well as sanctity, in his own idiom. And it will do all of us good, the most Protestant of us as well as those who (like the reviewer) belong to the Anglican Communion and hence feel a sympathy with much in Romanism while yet feeling impelled to adopt a severely critical attitude to Roman claims and much else in Roman belief. It will do us good, all of us, to read a book of this sort, and think through our own position in the light of such a statement. So we, as well as his fellow Romanists, can be grateful to Mr. Sheed.

W. NORMAN PITTINGER

General Theological Seminary, New York City.

Prayer and the Lord's Prayer. By CHARLES GORE. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1947. pp. xv-124. \$1.25.

This is a day when Christian people everywhere are worshiping, singly and corporately. Publishers are meeting the insistent need for worship helps in a most gratifying way, both in the quality of what is being offered and in the exceedingly attractive and practical formats in which various books of devotion are appearing. The reprinting of Bishop Gore's telling analysis of the Lord's Prayer together with his own exposition of prayer, is a timely contribution to the worship life of the Christian community. The original printing was made in 1896, and in the case of most literature that would be too long ago for profitable revival in a day so different and so crucial as this. However, the eternal and ineffable character of the Lord's Prayer and the unusual and universal quality of Bishop Gore's insights make this use of a previous exposition a rich addition to current worship material. No does the exquisite little volume lose by the 1947 introduction prepared by Angus Dun of the Washington Cathedral.

Bishop Gore deals first with prayer in general under the headings, "The efficacy of prayer," "Prayer in Christ's name," and "What may we pray for?" He then enters upon what will be to all who have not yet used it a most helpful analysis of the meaning and usage of the several familiar clauses of our Lord's prayer.

In his discussion of prayer as a mood and an experience, the author deals with the dilemma of the skeptic and the affirmations of the believer. He begins his comment with the startling but true statement that "the most powerful and rich of human faculties is the faculty of prayer." Some people will find this at first hard to accept. When, however, one thinks about the subtle and delicate human mechanisms which give a framework for the spirit, to the end that one may feel, may imagine, may *sense* the presence of the Unseen and become aware of Reality—one begins to see how true it is that no creature but man who is made in the image of God can enter into the sensitive adjustment which prayer at its best makes possible. One can also see that no other of man's faculties is so remarkable.

The "reality of the Object of prayer" is certified, says Gore, by the capacity

and the thirst of the worshiper for worship. He then makes the further strong point that even as the scientist has progressively made great discoveries by admitting the stubborn facts of the *real* world and by learning from those facts rather than by trying to gloss them over, so the Christian by practicing prayer and by acting on his theories comes to *know* of the truth and to be freed by the certainty of God's existence andregnancy in his world.

There are traces of a point of view probably more congenial to 1896 than 1948 in such comments as one on page 38, where the question of what we may pray for is being discussed. We may pray, says the Bishop, for a certain supply of physical things, and illustrates by "give us . . . our daily bread." "And that petition can be taken to cover prayers for health of body and bettering of social conditions and favorable weather." Few of us would combine the bettering of social conditions with the weather as objects of prayer, for few of us would agree that the bettering of social conditions is an adequate phrase for the desperate recognition of great Christians of our day for the need of the redemption of institutions which, by and large, create our human environment. We would, however, agree that in Jesus' phrases about bread and about God's will coming on earth as in heaven, we have the true clue to the worship of God both in *eternity* and in *time* —the imperative of a whole gospel in which personal and social religion are seen as indivisible.

WINNIFRED WYGAL

531 W. 122nd St., New York City.

The Soul of Frederick W. Robertson. By JAMES R. BLACKWOOD. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1947. pp. 201. \$2.00.

Frederick W. Robertson began his ministry in Trinity Chapel, Brighton, in 1847. He pursued his course there as a Christian prophet until 1853, six years of unparalleled service as a minister of the gospel. Shortly after his death there was a great demand for the publication of his sermons. Stopford Brooke stated in his *Life and Letters of Frederick Robertson* (1865), that fourteen editions of the sermons had been published in England since Robertson's death; at that time the ninth edition had been published in America and a German edition in Germany. Dr. Blackwood, in the book now under review, quotes from Dean Stanley: "It is not too much to say that he was the greatest preacher in the nineteenth century, and with the most powerful reasons for this judgment." This opinion can be easily confirmed by the testimony of numerous ministers and not a few laymen who have found in Robertson the solution of their religious problems.

It is doubtful whether there is any other preacher whose life and message has lasted as long and reached so many and diverse types of readers. The sermons are only part of the man, and though much may be surmised by the careful reader from them concerning his life and character, yet the personal factors demand a more intimate disclosure. This was given in the first instance in the above-mentioned work of Rev. Stopford A. Brooke, a clergyman of the Church of England, contemporary with his subject. He possessed marked literary ability, fine insight, and deep sympathy. He was of the Broad Church point of view and in every way specially fitted for his task. The book has long been out of print, though it is usually called the "definitive life."

Dr. Blackwood has written his book to meet the need of a general introduction to "the soul of Frederick W. Robertson." The principal phases of the life are reviewed, introducing the reader to periods of intellectual and spiritual crisis and bringing out the man's victorious spirit so often agitated by opposition, misunderstanding, and profound personal struggles. There are chapters of special interest on the groundwork of his sermons and his art as a preacher. The plan of the book scarcely affords space for the insertion of the letters which would give a more intimate knowledge of the preacher's inner life. The work will be useful, however, as a present-day guide to a more intimate knowledge of an extraordinary, sensitive, and rarely gifted minister of Jesus Christ. It is supplied with an excellent bibliography and index.

It may be well to call attention to some special aspects of Robertson's character and ministry. He did not come into the ministry in the usual way. From early youth he was intensely interested in the military profession. His father and grandfather had been distinguished officers in the British military establishment. But his father earnestly desired him to enter the ministry of the Church of England. He finally followed the leadings of family and friends to become a soldier of Jesus Christ.

He entered Brasenose College, Oxford, at a time when Oxford was agitated by religious controversy. The Tractarian movement led by John Henry Newman and his associates was vigorously attempting to establish what is now known as Anglo-Catholicism. Robertson felt the personal charm of Newman but resisted the movement and rejected the theory for all time. He was himself reared in the strict type of evangelicalism with a leaning toward moderate Calvinism. Eventually, he took his own way in what may be called biblical orthodox liberalism. His message was biblical, but in terms of life rather than dogma or ritual.

At the time of Robertson's ministry England was beginning to feel the rising tide of industrial life and the call to the church to consider specifically the welfare of the workingman. It was the day of Frederick Maurice and Charles Kingsley, but Robertson took his own way. In this connection we may note his famous lectures on the use of poetry, delivered to the workers of Brighton. He took part in the organization of a large group of workers. From time to time he was charged with heterodoxy and dangerous social teaching and activity. Stopford Brooke gives the following account of one of his encounters. A lady criticized him for his radical opinions and called his attention to the consequences of such dangerous teaching both in this world and the next. His answer was "I don't care." She said, "Do you know what don't care came to?" He replied, "Yes, Madam! He was crucified on Calvary."

One of his most characteristic utterances was made in a sermon preached in 1852. The occasion was the proposed opening of the Sydenham Palace on the Sabbath for the benefit, primarily, of the workingman. It was met by an outcry of opposition from the conventionally conservative people of the day. Robertson called for a better conception of the nature of the Christian day of rest, as Christ himself did in his own time. "No, my brethren, let us think clearly and strongly on this matter. It may be that God has a controversy with this people. It may be, as they say, that our Father will chasten us with the sword of the foreigner. But if he does, and if judgments are in store for our country, they will fall, not because the correspondence of the land is carried on upon the Sabbath day; nor

because Sunday trains are not arrested by the legislature; nor because a public permission is given the working classes for a few hours' recreation on the day of rest—but because we are selfish men; and because we prefer pleasure to duty, and traffic to honor; and because we love our party more than our church, and our church more than our Christianity, and our Christianity more than truth, and ourselves more than all. These are the things that defile a nation; but the labor and recreation of its poor, these are not the things that defile a nation." (Robertson's *Sermons*, Harper, 1871, p. 352.)

The central aim of his life may be summed up in the closing words of his great sermon, "The Kingdom of the Truth." "From the trial hour of Christ—from the Cross of the Son of God—there arises the principle to which his life bore witness, that the first lesson of the Christian life is this, Be true—and the second is this, Be true—and the third, this, Be true!" (*Ibid.*, p. 226.)

FRANKLIN N. PARKER

Emory University, Georgia.

Towards the Conversion of England. Toronto: J. M. Dent & Sons (Canada), Ltd., 1946. pp. 172. \$1.00.

This book is "the religious sensation of the century" according to the modest announcement of the publishers. As the title indicates, it is a Canadian reprint, for readers in Canada and the U. S. A., of the Report of a Commission on Evangelism of the Church of England which was first published in Britain in 1945.

The Commission accepts the following definition of evangelism given by the Archbishop's Committee on Evangelism in 1918: "To evangelize is so to present Christ Jesus in the power of the Holy Spirit, that men shall come to put their trust in God through him, to accept him as their Saviour and serve him as their King in the fellowship of his Church."

There are six chapters, dealing with "The Situation Before the Church," "The Gospel," "The Apostolate of the Whole Church," "Evangelism: Proclaiming the Gospel," "Evangelism: Preparing for the Gospel," and "The Church, Christ's Weapon in Evangelism." In addition there is a concluding section, together with recommendations, findings, and a lengthy bibliography.

This Report declares that the Church of England should give first place in her work to evangelism. The reasons for this are twofold: "(1) the widespread decline in churchgoing; and (2) the collapse of Christian moral standards." The underlying causes for "the drift from religion" are dealt with very thoroughly—the scientific outlook, the mechanical mind, urbanization, secular education, war, and the humanistic outlook of many people. The book gives emphasis to "the apostolate of the laity" and calls for a renewal of the work of the laity in evangelism. For this purpose the laity should be trained by means of evangelistic "cells" in local parishes as well as in training schools and schools for leaders. A new stress on dogma is called for, which is defined as "revealed truth." Evangelism is only possible when the church has theological convictions about Christian truth. The Bible, therefore, which is the source of Christian dogma, must be given a new place of significance in the church.

The Report breaks new ground in calling for an extensive use of the radio, cinema, drama, the press, and other means of communicating knowledge as agen-

cies in evangelism. The whole of life must be evangelized. The gospel must be made relevant to "industry, politics, and commerce," but just how this is to be done we are not told. The appointment of industrial chaplains would appear to be only one step in this direction. This reviewer believes, with others, that the main weakness of this book is in its superficial treatment of the social witness of evangelism. The Report is dedicated to the memory of Dr. William Temple, but it lacks his pungent insights and guidance on social affairs.

Other matters of interest are the call to "simplicity in worship"; the request for "a new church catechism . . . put forth by authority, which would be fuller and more explicit than the one in the Prayer Book"; and the expression of a deep desire for ecumenical co-operation in evangelism.

This is undoubtedly a great document on evangelism. Its message is rooted in biblical soil and it is directed toward the contemporary scene, especially the modern mind with its curtains of insensibility drawn to keep out the light of religious truth. While it is a Church of England Report, its value is by no means parochial or denominational. All churches can profit from its statements and recommendations.

R. C. CHALMERS

Board of Evangelism and Social Service, The United Church of Canada,
Toronto, Ontario.

The Spirit of Chinese Culture. By Francis C. M. Wei. Scribner. \$2.75. An interpretation of the philosophy and religion of China by the President of Hua Chung University, Wuchang (the first Henry W. Luce Visiting Professor of World Christianity at Union Seminary, New York). "A subject of central importance treated by a master." — K. S. Latourette.

A Man Can Live. By Bernard Idings Bell. Harper. \$1.50. A fitting sequel to *God Is Not Dead*, written in Dr. Bell's usual vigorous, realistic style. "To be artist and lover, that is the true goal, the only adequate objective, the divinely destined end for man."

The Sin of Our Age. By D. R. Davies. Macmillan. \$2.00. With "arresting imagery and illustration," a British thinker diagnoses our root sin as "glory to Man in the highest," and calls for recovery of Christian belief.

Toward the Understanding of Je-

sus. By Vladimir G. Simkhovitch. Macmillan. \$2.75. A reprint of the well-known work of this professor of economic history, relating Jesus' teaching to the historical situation of his time, with a new preface for today; includes also "Rome's Fall Reconsidered" and "Hay and History."

The Only Way. By Karl Barth. Philosophical Library. \$2.00. Subtitled "How Can the Germans be Cured?" A fine, brief discussion designed originally for Swiss Christians. Stresses the need of the Germans for a new opportunity to learn responsibility; calls upon Swiss Christians to show neither a sentimental condoning nor a Pharisaic condemning attitude, but constructive friendship.

Hindu Philosophy. By Theos Bernard. Philosophical Library. \$3.75. An attempt "to outline the essence of the six classic systems of Hindu philosophy . . . a graduated interpretation of the Ultimate Reality."

Therefore Choose Life. By Edith Lovejoy Pierce. Harper. \$1.75. Another volume of poems by the author of *In This Our Day*. "Mrs. Pierce interprets . . . with the sensitive insight of a genuine mystic who has wrestled with the angels of pain, sorrow, and joy till they have blessed her with understanding."

Frontier Books: Stories from the Lives of Christian Pioneers in North America. Friendship Press. Paper, 15¢ each. Now available: numbers on George Washington Carver, Samuel Chapman Armstrong, Jason Lee, Robert Terril Rundle.

That All May Know. Edited by Lucy M. Eldredge. Friendship Press. Paper, 40¢. A study course in world evangelism for young people, prepared co-operatively by youth leaders in several denominations.

Dark Glory. By Harry V. Richardson. Friendship Press. Cloth, \$2.00; paper, \$1.00. A picture of the church among Negroes in the rural South; its history, present conditions, problems; an illuminating study by the former chaplain of Tuskegee, now field director of a training program for the Negro rural ministry under the Home Missions Council.

The Protestant Faith. By George A. Crapullo. Abingdon-Cokesbury. Paper, 25¢. "The time has come for a strong presentation and a wide dissemination of the fundamental ideas of Protestantism." Protestantism's origin, principles, achievements, opportunities, responsibility in America.

The Protestant Heritage. By Samuel McCrea Cavert. Association Press. 5¢. A briefer statement.

Worship Services and Programs for Beginners. By Flora E. Breck. W. A. Wilde, Boston. \$1.50. Meets a need in a field where material is difficult to find; also useful to parents and to teachers of the primary group.

Know Your Bible Better. By Frederick Hall. W. A. Wilde. \$1.25. "A Thousand and One Bible Questions and Answers." A useful and pleasant quiz book to combat biblical illiteracy.

Who Am I? By John B. Walther. Macmillan. \$2.00. Twenty "Bible quizzes" in the form of graphic little studies of biblical personalities, delivered originally to cadets at West Point by their chaplain.

Peloubet's Select Notes on the International Bible Lessons, 1948. By Wilbur M. Smith. W. A. Wilde. \$2.50. Seventy-fourth Annual Volume.

Pendle Hill Pamphlets on Relationships, Nos. 35-38. Friends Center for Religious and Social Study, Wallingford, Pennsylvania. \$1.00. A series of four sensitive and delightful addresses by women for women, originally delivered to a small Quaker group in Philadelphia. The "relationships" treated range from nearest to farthest: "The Self to the Self," "Martha and Mary: A Woman's Relationship to Her Home," "Are Your Meetings Held in the Life?" and finally Dr. Anna Brinton's "Wide Horizon," concerning world-wide relationships as experienced in Friends' international visitation.